8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

## FILED

Steven Fishman Federal Register Number 17280-004 FCI Terminal Island Post Office Box #3007 San Pedro, California 90733-3007

Petitioner In Pro Se

OCT 02 2017

SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff/Respondent,

STEVEN FISHMAN,

Defendant/Petitioner/ Claimant.

CASE NO: CR-88-0616-DLJ

PETITION AND DEMAND OF PETITIONER STEVEN FISHMAN FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT WITH REGARD TO QUESTIONS OF LAW, PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §2201, SEEKING REMEDY AND RELIEF REGARDING JURISDICTIONAL DEFECTS IN CASE NUMBER CR-88-0616-DLJ

COMES NOW the Defendant/Petitioner/Claimant, STEVEN FISHMAN, hereinafter referred to as the "Petitioner," a Federal Prisoner in Pro Se without the benefit of any Bar member Attorney, and presents a Petition and Demand of Petitioner Steven Fishman for Declaratory Judgment With Regard to Questions of Law, Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2201, Seeking Remedy and Relief Regarding Jurisdictional Defects in Case Number CR-88-0616-DLJ.

28 U.S.C. §2201, Creation of Remedy, states in pertinent

1

8

9

7

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

part: "(a) In a case of actual controversy within its jurisdiction, ... any court of the United States, upon the filing of an appropriate pleading, may declare the rights and other legal relations of any interested party seeking declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought. Any such declaration shall have the force and effect of a final judgment or decree, and shall be reviewable as such."

"To create an 'actual controversy,' a plaintiff must allege facts that, 'under all the circumstances, show that there is a substantial controversy, between parties having adverse legal interests, of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment." E. & J. Gallo Winery v. Proximo Spirits, Inc., 583 Fed. Appx. 632, 634 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing to Medimmune, Inc. v. Genentech Inc., 549 U.S. 118, 127, 127 S.Ct. 764, 166 L.Ed.2d 604, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 1003 (2007)).

The Declaratory Judgment/Determination Demanded Herein will serve to:

(1)Settle the controversy/question of whether or not it is lawful for Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government of the United States to enter the several states of the Union outside Federal Enclaves, under force of arms, in order to subject the inhabitants of the several states of the Union who are outside of Federal

. 

Enclaves, to the application and enforcement of Federal Law and Regulation;

- (2) Clarify the legal relation at issue; and:
- (3) Serve the public interest in resolving the uncertainty:
- (i) Of whether or not it is lawful for a United States District Court Judge of a United States District Court located within any of the several states of the Union, to take jurisdiction of any Federal Criminal Case and impose a criminal sentence under the criminal laws of the Federal Government of the United States without evidence in the record of the court to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that every location relevant to the Federal Criminal Case is in Federal Enclaves which comprise the Federal Judicial District;
- (ii) Of whether or not all Judgments, Decrees, Rulings and Opinions rendered by Federal District Court Judges of United States District Courts, specifically and particularly District Courts located within the several states of the Union, outside the Territorial Limits of the District of Columbia, the Federal Territories, the Federal Commonwealths, the Federal Possessions and Federal Enclaves of the United States Federal Government, are Foreign Judgments with regard to the several states of the Union; and when applying such Foreign Judgments within

the Territorial Borders of any of the several states of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the Union against any inhabitant of any one of the several states of the Union outside of any Federal Enclave, thereby rendering such Federal Court Judgments, including "Judgments in a Criminal Case," repugnant to the Constitution, NULL AND VOID, and Legal Nullities.

Of whether or not Officers, Agents, and (iii) Employees of the Federal Government of the United States, who, while acting in their individual and private capacity(ies), engage in the act of civil misconduct of conspiracy under color or pretense of any Federal Statute, Ordinance, Regulation, Custom, or Usage of any [Federal] State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, Enclave, or the District of Columbia; in order to subject or cause to be subjected, any citizen of the United States, or other person within the Jurisdiction or Control of the Federal Government of the United States, to the deprivation of any right(s), privilege(s), or immunity(ies) secured and/or protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States; and are therefore liable to the party injured in an action at Law [Tort], suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress under the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced by the Act of Congress at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, and 42 U.S.C. §1986.

(iv) Of whether or not an action for recovery of money damages and other equitable relief under the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced by the Act of Congress at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, is exempt from any statute of limitations; is exempt from exhaustion of administrative remedy requirements; and exempt from an official immunity defense when Officers, Agents, and Employees are sued in their individual and private capacity(ies).

Inasmuch as a Declaratory Judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2201 will be dispositive of the current matter before the Court, a Request for a Speedy Hearing as contemplated at Federal Rule of Civil Procedure is being concomitantly and simultaneously filed herewith, moving the Court for a Speedy Hearing within sixty (60) days from the date of filing herein.

Furthermore, the Petitioner has reserved the right to request additional Remedy and Relief based on the Declaratory Judgment, pursuant to the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2202.

The Demand for Declaratory Judgment/Determination follows:

## I. DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED

 such, Judicial Decrees, Judgments, or Orders cannot be construed as substitutes for Acts of Congress or the Supreme Law of the Land.

Furthermore, inasmuch as all Judgments, Decrees, Rulings, and Opinions of any Federal Judge, whether it be a Supreme Court Justice, an Appellate Court Judge, a District Court Judge, or any other Federal Judge, which has been rendered in violation of the Constitution; or rendered in violation of an Act of Congress; or rendered without Jurisdiction over the Parties or over the Subject Matter; or rendered in violation of Due Process of Law; are VOID, without force or effect, and are therefore <a href="Legal Nullities">Legal Nullities</a>. Specifically and particularly, whether or not such VOID JUDGMENTS have yet to be challenged does not alter the fact that such VOID JUDGMENTS are in fact <a href="Legal Nullities">Legal Nullities</a>.

In order to avoid the possibility of reliance on VOID JUDGMENTS/Legal Nullities which comprise much of Federal Judicial Case Precedent, the provisions of the Supreme Law of the Land have been exclusively relied upon for the Basis of Law for all Nineteen (19) Declaratory Judgments Demanded herein.

Therefore, STEVEN FISHMAN, the Petitioner in the instant case and/or controversy under Article III, hereby demands remedy in the nature of a Declaratory Judgment/Determination with Regard to Questions of Law set forth herein; and that

the Declaratory Judgment, and specifically and particularly each and every Judgment contained herein, be either Affirmed or Denied; and that the Constitutional and Statutory basis for any such denial be provided in writing; and that this be done as a prerequisite and condition precedent prior to this case, or any aspect of it, moving forward, as the following Rules of Law are critical to the underpinnings of the instant case. All Declaratory Judgments Demanded herein will be deemed Affirmed by Tacit Acceptance, should the Court neglect or refuse to respond within sixty (60) days of the filing of this Petition.

# QUESTIONS AND RULINGS OF LAW DEMANDED PÜRSUANT TO THE DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ACT: 28 U.S.C. §2201

#### QUESTION 1:

Is the Constitution of the United States, all Laws of the United States made in pursuance to the Constitution, and all Treaties already existing at the time of ratification or will be made after ratification of the Constitution, the Supreme Law of the Land? .

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 1: The provisions of the Constitution at Article VI,

Clause 2, establishes the composition of the Supreme Law of the Land, as follows: "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land...."

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 1]:

It is therefore Declared that the Supreme Law of the Land is the Constitution of the United States, and the Laws of the United States, which are made in Pursuance to the Constitution, and all Treaties already existing at the time of ratification of the Constitution as well as those Treaties to be made after ratification of the Constitution of the United States.

#### QUESTION 2:

Are all Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government of the United States, and all Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Governments of the several states of the Union, required to, by oath or affirmation, agree to uphold the Supreme Law of the Land, and to provide allegiance to the Supreme Law of the Land?

## BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 2:

The provisions of the Constitution at Article VI, Clause 3, Oath of Office, requires that: "The Senators

and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution..."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Congress, as evidenced at 5 U.S.C. §3331, Oath of Office, requires the following oath or affirmation of all Officers, Agents and Employees of the Federal Government of the United States with the exception of the President of the United States: "An individual, except the President, elected or appointed to an office of honor or profit in the civil service or uniformed services, shall take the following oath: "I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about So help me God." This section does not affect to enter. other oaths required by law."

Article II, Section 1, Clause 8, provides the text of the oath (affirmation) of the President, as follows:
"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend

the Constitution of the United States."

As evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §453, Congress requires an additional oath or affirmation of all Federal Judges as follows: "I, ---, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as --- under the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God."

### DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 2]:

It is therefore Declared that all Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government of the United States, and all Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Government of the several states of the Union, are bound by oath or affirmation to support, uphold, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, and to bear allegiance to the Constitution of the United States.

#### QUESTION 3:

Do the several states of the Union, by and through their respective Representatives and Senators, comprise the United States Legislative Department?

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 3:

The provisions of the Constitution at Article I, Section

1, <u>Legislative Powers Vested in Congress</u>, establishes: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

.15

The provisions of the Constitution at Article I, Section 2, Clause 1, House of Representatives -- Composition -- Electors, establishes that "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature."

To qualify as a State Representative pursuant to Article I, Section 2, Clause 2, of the Constitution, Qualifications of Representatives, this Clause establishes: "No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the Age of twenty-five Years, and have been seven Years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen."

The provisions of the Constitution at Article I, Section 3, Clause 1, Senate -- Composition, establish that "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote."

The Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution modified Article I, Section 3, Clauses 1 and 2, with regard to the

election and vacancies, establishing that "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

When vacancies happen in the representation of any
State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State
shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided,
That the legislature of any State may empower the executive
thereof to make temporary appointments until the people
fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct."

Article I, Section 3, Clause 3, Qualifications of Senators, establishes that "No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and have been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 3]:

It is therefore declared that the several states of the Union, by and through their respective Representatives and Senators, comprise the United States Legislative Department.

//

QUESTION 4:

Do the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, vest exclusive and absolute power in the several states of the Union, by and through the states' Representatives and Senators in Congress, to, by legislation, carry into execution or rescind all powers vested by the Constitution in the Federal Government of the United States; powers vested in the Executive Department; Judicial Department; Legislative Department; and the Officers of said Departments?

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 4:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, All Necessary and Proper Laws, establishes that the several states of the Union, by and through their delegations in Congress, are vested with the exclusive and absolute power by legislation, to carry into execution all powers vested by the Constitution in the Federal Government of the United States; or to rescind any Constitutional powers, as follows: The Congress shall have Power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof." The "foregoing powers" are enumerated within Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 through 17. "Officers thereof" refer to the Executive Department and all of the Officers, Agents and Employees of the Executive Department;

and the Judicial Department and all of the Officers, Agents and Employees of the Judicial Department, specifically the Judges.

As evidenced by the Act of Congress evidenced at 50 U.S.C. §1541(b), Congressional Legislative Power Under

Necessary and Proper Clause, the several states of the
Union, by and through Congress, expressed recognition that
the several states of the Union in Congress have the exclusive
and absolute power by legislation, to carry into execution
or rescind all powers vested by the Constitution in the
Federal Government of the United States as follows: "(b)
Under Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution, it is
specifically provided that the Congress shall have the
power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying
into execution, not only its own powers, but also all other
powers vested by the Constitution in the [Federal] Government
of the United States, or in any department of officer thereof."

The provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, use the word "for" with reference to the legislative powers of Congress, to establish the express and limited purpose of legislation <u>for</u> either implementing or rescinding any and all power vested by the Constitution in the Federal Government of the United States.

//

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 4]:

It is therefore Declared that Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, vests exclusive and absolute power in the several states of the Union, by and through State Representatives and Senators, for the express and limited purpose by legislation, to carry into execution or rescind any and all powers vested by the Constitution in the Federal Government of the United States; powers vested in the Executive Department and the Office of the Executive Department; and powers vested in the Judicial Department and the Officers of the Judicial Department, specifically the Judges; and the Legislative Department.

#### QUESTION 5:

Do the provisions of the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, limit the Federal Government's powers expressly delegated in writing to the Federal Government of the United States by the Constitution, and reserve all powers not prohibited by the Constitution to the States, or to the People; and prohibit Federal Officers, Agents and Employees, specifically Federal Judges, from establishing unwritten implied, self-executing, extra-Constitutional powers for themselves and/or the Federal Government?

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 5:

The provisions of the Tenth Amendment establish that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, all powers delegated to the Federal Government of the United States by the Constitution are dormant, unless and until the several states of the Union in Congress, implement by legislation specific powers delegated to the Federal Government of the United States. The states in Congress can, by legislation, rescind any Federal Power previously implemented by the several states of the Union.

Unwritten, implied, extraconstitutional powers created by judicial decree, cannot be implemented by the several states of the Union, acting collectively in Congress; as such unwritten, extraconstitutional power created by judicial decree cannot lawfully be ratified by the People, as required by Article V and VII of the United States Constitution, making it impossible for the several states of the Union in Congress by legislation, to implement such unwritten, implied, extraconstitutional power.

Article III, Section 2; Clauses 1 and 2 of the United States Constitution, delegates specific and limited jurisdiction to the Federal Judicial Department, which

27

28

2

3

4

has been carried into execution by the several states of the Union in Congress by legislation which includes but is not limited to 28 U.S.C. §1251 et. seq., Original Jurisdiction; 28 U.S.C. §1291 et. seq., Final Decisions of District Courts; and 28 U.S.C. §1390, et. seq., Scope. There is no evidence that the Constitution delegates any power to the Federal Judicial Department by Judicial Decree to vest the Federal Government or the Judicial Department with implied, self-executing, extraconstitutional powers.

There is no evidence that the several states of the Union in Congress, by legislation, authorized the Federal Judicial Department by judicial decree, to vest unwritten, implied, self-executing, extraconstitutional power in the Federal Government of the United States.

The provisions of the Articles of Confederation and the Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution recognize that the states are independent sovereign Constitutional Republics, which, upon membership in and to the Union, agreed to exercise certain sovereign powers collectively with the sister states of the Union, rather than independently; such as the powers vested in the several states of the Union collectively in Congress at Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 through 18; whereas all other powers are exercised by the several states of the Union independently. several states of the Union retain exclusive and absolute power in Congress of all powers vested by the United States

Constitution in the Federal Government of the United States.

The Federal Government has no power except those specific powers implemented through legislation by the several states of the Union in Congress, which have not otherwise been rescinded. All other powers delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution remain dormant.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Both the several states of the Union as well as the Federal Government are equally prohibited from exercising certain powers, as evidenced in Article I, Section 10, Clause 1, Powers Denied States -- Treaties -- Money --Ex Post Facto Laws -- Obligation of Contracts; and the Fourteenth Amendment, [as an example], prohibiting the making or enforcing any law abridging any privilege or immunity of the Citizens of the United States, enforced by the several states of the Union in Congress pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, Power To Enforce Amendment: "The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this Article," and the Acts of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1981, et. seq., Equal Rights Under the Law; and 18 U.S.C. §241, Conspiracy Against Rights; and 18 U.S.C. §242, Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law; making it an act of civil and criminal misconduct to violate any right protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States by the enforcement of any State or Federal Law, Policy, and/or Custom.

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 5]:

It is therefore Declared that the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution limits the powers of the Federal Government to only those powers that have been expressly delegated in writing to the Federal Government, which have been implemented by the several states of the Union in Congress by legislation, with all other powers delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution remaining dormant.

It is further Declared that the several states of the Union are Sovereign Constitutional Republics, which agreed upon membership in and to the Union, to exercise certain Sovereign Powers collectively, rather than independently; such as those powers vested in the several states of the Union collectively in Congress at Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 through 18; and all other powers are exercised by the several states of the Union independently, except those powers expressly prohibited to the several states by the Constitution of the United States.

It is further Declared that all political power is inherent in the People: the Body Politic.

#### QUESTION 6:

Do the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, limit the Territorial, Legislative Jurisdiction of

-19-

•

the Federal Government exclusively to the seat of the Federal Government of the United States [currently the District of Columbia], and over all properties purchased by the Federal Government by consent of the legislature of the State where such property is located, for the express purpose to erect forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards and other needful buildings?

## BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 6:

The provisions of the United States Constitution at Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, Authority Over Places

Purchased or Ceded, provide that the Federal Government of the United States can only "...exercise exclusive

Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful buildings."

As evidenced by the Act of Congress at 40 U.S.C. §3112, Federal Jurisdiction [formerly 40 U.S.C. §255], the power vested in the several states of the Union in Congress at Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 to establish Federal Territorial, Legislative and Judicial Jurisdiction over

Federal Enclaves/Areas located in the several states of the Union, remained a dormant power until 1940, when the several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, implemented the power to establish Federal Jurisdiction over Federal Enclaves/Areas located in the several states of the Union, by enacting the statute evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112.

Prior to the Act evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112, it was not possible for the Federal Government to establish Federal Territorial Legislative, or Judicial Jurisdiction over any Federally owned property located in the several states of the Union, exclusive or otherwise, whether said property was an empty parcel, military installation, or any other Federal Facility located in the several states of the Union, including but not limited to Federal District Courts.

The states in Congress [as evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112], established the procedure to create excusive Federal Jurisdiction over Federal Enclaves/Areas located in the several states of the Union, as follows:

#### 40 U.S.C. §3112:

(a) Exclusive Jurisdiction Not Required: It is not required that the Federal Government obtain exclusive jurisdiction in the United States over land or an interest in land it acquires.

- (b) Acquisition and Acceptance of Jurisdiction:
  When the head of a department, agency, or independent
  establishment of the [Federal] Government, or other authorized
  officer of the department, agency, or independent establishment,
  considers it desirable, that individual may accept or secure,
  from the State in which land or an interest in land that
  is under the immediate jurisdiction, custody or control
  of the individual is situated, consent to, or cession of,
  any jurisdiction over the land or interest not previously
  obtained. The individual shall indicate acceptance of
  jurisdiction on behalf of the [Federal] Government by filing a notice
  of acceptance with the Governor of the State or in another
  manner prescribed by the laws of the State where the land
  is situated. (emphasis added).
- (c) <u>Presumption</u>: It is conclusively presumed that jurisdiction has not been accepted until the Government accepts jurisdiction over land as provided in this section.

For any property located in a state of the Union to be a Federal Enclave, three conditions must be present:

(1) The Federal Government of the United States must purchase land from a state for the purpose of erecting forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards or other needful buildings; (2) the state Legislature must consent to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government; and: (3) the Federal Government must accept jurisdiction by filing a Notice

of Acceptance with the Governor of the state, or in another manner prescribed by the laws of the state where the land is situated.

Pursuant to the Act of Congress evidenced at 4 U.S.C. §110(e), <u>Definitions</u>, "The term "Federal area" means any lands or premises held or acquired by or for the use of the United States[,] or any department, establishment, or agency of the United States; and any Federal area, or any part thereof, which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State, shall be deemed to be a Federal area located within such State."

Unless the conditions of 40 U.S.C. §3112 have been complied with, no "Federal Area" located in the several states of the Union is a Federal Enclave/Area, as such "Federal Area" is nor would not be subject to Federal Territorial, Legislative, or Judicial Jurisdiction.

The several states of the Union in Congress, as evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §7(3), Special Maritime and Territorial

Jurisdiction of the United States Defined, established that "The term .. Territorial Jurisdiction of the United States" as used in Title 18 of the United States Code, includes and is limited to... "Any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States, and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof, or any place purchased or otherwise acquired by the [Federal Government of the]

United States by consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of a fort, magazine, arsenal, dockyard, or other needful building."

Pursuant to the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, as carried into execution by the several states of the Union in Congress pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, as evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112, Federal Territorial, Legislative and Judicial Jurisdiction within any of the several states of the Union, exists only on Federal Property subject to exclusive Federal Jurisdiction pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3112. All Federal Judicial Districts located in the several states of the Union which are established by Federal Legislation, must be comprised exclusively of Federal Enclaves located in the several states of the Union.

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 6]:

It is therefore Declared that the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, limit the Territorial, Legislative and Judicial Jurisdiction of the Federal Government exclusively to the seat of the Federal Government of the United States, the Territories, Insular Possessions, and over all property purchased by the Federal Government by consent of the legislature, where such property is located, over which exclusive or concurrent Federal Territorial Jurisdiction has been established, pursuant to Article I, Section 8,

Clause 18, as evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112.

It is further Declared that Federal Territorial,
Legislative, and Judicial Jurisdiction within any of the
several states of the Union, exists only on Federal Property
subject to exclusive Federal Jurisdiction pursuant to 40
U.S.C. §3112.

It is further Declared that all Federal Judicial Districts located in the several states of the Union which are established by Federal Legislation, must be comprised exclusively of Federal Enclaves/Areas located in the several states of the Union.

#### QUESTION 7:

Do the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, prohibit the Federal Government of the United States, and the Government of the several states of the Union, from making or enforcing any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States?

## BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 7:

The provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, Citizens of the United States, provides that: "...No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person

Ţ

within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5,

Power to Enforce Amendment, provide that the several states of
the Union in Congress has the exclusive absolute power, by
legislation, to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment, as follows:

"The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." [the Fourteenth Amendment].

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, and the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, as evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1981 et. seq., and 18 U.S.C. §241 and §242, established that it is both a civil and a criminal act of misconduct to deprive an inhabitant, such as the Petitioner, of any right protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States. For example: See: 42 U.S.C. §1983, Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights:

"Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer

.

for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a <u>declaratory decree</u> was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable." (emphasis added).

42 U.S.C. §1985(3), <u>Depriving Persons of Rights or Privileges</u>, states:

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire, or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws, ... in any case of conspiracy set forth in this section, if one or more persons engaged therein do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property, or deprived of having and exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages, occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators."

18 U.S.C. §241, Conspiracy Against Rights, states:

"If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of <u>any</u> right or privilege secured to him by

the Coof his go in with i of any under or both

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

.26

27

28

the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured -- They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both..." (emphasis added).

And, 18 U.S.C. §242, Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law, states:

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, ... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping [unlawful imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §1201] or an attempt to kidnap ... shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death."

The several states of the Union in Congress, as evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1343, Civil Rights and Elective Franchise, in vesting Federal District Courts with authority/jurisdiction for civil actions for damages for violation of any right or privilege protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States, established at 28 U.S.C. §1343(b)(1), that:
"For purposes of this section -- (1) the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a State..."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, as carried into execution pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, by the Act of Congress evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112, Federal Legislative Authority exists within the territorial borders of the several states of the Union exists only within Federal Enclaves. Federal Judicial Districts located in the several states of the Union are comprised exclusively of Federal Enclaves.

The several states of the Union in Congress, by the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §132, Creation and Composition of District Courts, District Courts must be located in a Judicial District comprised of a Federal Enclave. 28 U.S.C. §132(a) states: "There shall be in each judicial district a district court which shall be a court of record known as the United States District Court for the district."

The several states of the Union in Congress, by the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §132(b), requires that: "Justices or judges designated or assigned shall be competent to sit

as judges of the court."

б

The several states of the Union in Congress, by the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §134, Tenure and Residence of District Judges, establishes that for judges to be competent to sit as judges of the court, (a) "The district judges shall hold office during good behavior," and (b) "shall reside in the district or one of the districts for which he is appointed," requiring said judge to reside in a Federal Enclave.

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §751(c), <u>Clerks</u>, requires that the Clerk is to reside in the district for which he is appointed, which requires the clerk to reside in a Federal Enclave: "The clerk of each district court shall reside in the district for which he is appointed..."

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §545(a), Residence, requires that the United States Attorney shall reside in the district for which he is appointed, which requires the United States Attorney to reside in a Federal Enclave. 28 U.S.C. §545(a) states: "Each United States attorney shall reside in the district for which he is appointed..."

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1865(b), Qualification For Jury Service, establishes that for any person to qualify

to serve on [Federal] Grand and Petit Juries in a District Court, said person must reside for at least a period of one year within the judicial district, which requires said person to reside in a Federal Enclave that comprise the Judicial District. 28 U.S.C. §1865(b) states: "In making such determination[,] the chief judge of the district court, or such other district court judge as the plan may provide, or the clerk if the court's jury selection plan so provides, shall deem any person qualified to serve on grand and petit juries in the district court unless he -- (1) is not a citizen of the United States eighteen years old who has resided for a period of one year within the judicial district..." (emphasis added).

Since it is a standard practice to summon a Special Grand Jury in all Federal Criminal Cases filed in United States District Courts located in the several states of the Union; the several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to the Act evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §3331, Summoning and Term, requires that in order to summon a Special Grand Jury, it must be established that: "... each district court which is located in a judicial district containing more than four million inhabitants ..." requires said inhabitants to reside exclusively in Federal Enclaves which comprise the Federal Judicial District, or that "the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, or any designated Assistant Attorney General, certifies

in writing to the chief judge of the district that in his judgment, a special grand jury is necessary because of criminal activity in the district [within Federal Enclaves] shall order a special grand jury to be summoned at least once in each period of eighteen months unless another special grand jury is then serving..." 18 U.S.C. §3331(a). (emphasis added).

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2071 et. seq., Rule-Making Power Generally, vested in (a) "The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act[s] of Congress..." with the authority and power to prescribe general rules of practice and procedure and rules of evidence for cases in the United States District Courts and Courts of Appeal. Since the several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2071, et. seq., vest the Supreme Court with the power to establish rules of procedure, by extension, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, as examples, established by the Supreme Court, are Acts of Congress.

Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 18, Place of

Prosecution and Trial, establishes that all Federal Offenses
be prosecuted in the district [Federal Enclave] where the
offense was committed. The court must set the place of
trial within the district [Federal Enclave]. Federal Rule
of Criminal Procedure 18 states: "Unless a statute or these
rules permit otherwise, the government must prosecute an

offense in a district [Federal Enclave] where the offense was committed. The court must set the place of trial within the district [Federal Enclave]..." (emphasis added).

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to the Act evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §3231, District Courts, vested "The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States. Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several states under the laws thereof."

Laws of the United States can only exist and be enforced Constitutionally in the District of Columbia, the Federal Territories, the Insular Possessions, and the Federal Enclaves located in the several states of the Union.

The several states of the Union in Congress, by the Act evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §7, Special Maritime and Territorial Jurisdiction of the United States Defined, establishes that "The term ... territorial jurisdiction of the United States, as used in this title, includes [and is limited to]: (3) Any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States, and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof, or any place purchased or otherwise acquired by the United States by consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of a fort,

magazine, arsenal, dockyard or other needful building."

Any Officer, Agent, or Employee of the Federal Government of the United States, who, while being under oath or affirmation to uphold the Supreme Law of the Land, who enters the several states of the Union under force of arms outside any Federal Enclave, to subject the inhabitants of the several states of the Union to the application and enforcement of any :Federal Law of the United States, engages in the civil and criminal acts of misconduct identified by the several states of the Union in Congress at 42 U.S.C. §1981 et. seq. and 18 U.S.C. §241 and §242 respectively, as conspiracy under color of [Federal] Law to deprive the inhabitants of the several states of the Union of rights protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1.

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 7]:

It is therefore Declared that the Provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, prohibits the Federal Government of the United States, and the Government of the several states of the Union, from making or enforcing any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States.

It is further Declared that any Officer, Agent, or Employee of the Federal Government of the United States, who, while being under oath or affirmation to uphold the Supreme Law of the Land, who enters the several states of the Union under force of arms outside any Federal Enclave, in order to subject the inhabitants of the several states of the Union to the application and enforcement of any Federal Law of the United States; said Officer, Agent, or Employee of the Federal Government is engaged in the civil and criminal act of misconduct identified by the several states of the Union in Congress at 42 U.S.C. §1981, et. seq., and 18 U.S.C. §241 and §242, as conspiracy under color of [Federal] law to deprive the inhabitants of the several states of the Union of rights protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1.

#### QUESTION 8:

Do the provisions of the Acts of Congress evidenced at 1 U.S.C. §114, <u>Sealing of Instruments</u>, and 28 U.S.C. §1691, <u>Seal and Teste of Process</u>, establish that if any writ or process, that being any written Order, Judgment, Decree, Summons, or Warrant issued by any court of the United States as defined by the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §451, <u>Definitions</u>, is NULL AND VOID, without legal force or effect, and a <u>Legal Nullity</u>, when issued and filed without being authenticated by the impressed seal of the court, and countersigned by the Clerk of the Court?

I

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 8:

By the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §451, <u>Definitions</u>, the several states of the Union in Congress established that the term "court of the United States" as used in the context of the Acts of Congress evidenced by the United States

Code, specifically Title 28 U.S.C., means as follows:

"As used in this title: The term "court of the United States" includes the Supreme Court of the United States, courts of appeals, district courts constituted by Chapter 5 of this title [28 U.S.C. §81, et. seq.], including the Court of International Trade and any court created by Act of Congress the judges of which are entitled to hold office during good behavior."

The Act's specific reference that only the courts created by Acts of Congress, the judges of which are entitled to hold office during good behavior, being included with the Supreme Court of the United States, and the provisions of Article III, Section 1, vesting the several states of the Union acting in Congress with power to ordain and establish inferior courts to the Supreme Court; and to provide that the judges of such courts, the Supreme Court and the inferior courts should hold their office during good behavior; signifying that all such courts are established under the power vested by Article III of the Constitution of the United States in the states of the Union in Congress.

The provisions of the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §451 confirm the status of "courts of the United States," and that of a "judge of the United States" by establishing the meaning of the following terms:

"The terms "district court" and "district court of the United States" mean the courts constituted by Chapter 5 of this title [28 U.S.C. §81, et. seq.];" and:

"The term "judge of the United States" includes judges of the courts of appeals, district courts, Court of International Trade[,] and any court created by Act of Congress, the judges of which are entitled to hold office during good behavior." and:

"The term "justice of the United States" includes the Chief Justice of the United States and the associate justices of the Supreme Court."

The provisions of the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §134, establish that district court judges are in fact a "judge of the United States," and hold office under Article III of the Constitution, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §134(a):

"The district judges shall hold office during good behavior."

The several states of the Union in Congress, by and through legislation evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1691, <u>Seal</u>

4 5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

and Teste of Process, mandates that: "All writs and process issuing from a court of the United States shall be under the seal of the court and signed by the clerk thereof."

Congress further provided at 1 U.S.C. §114, Sealing of Instruments:

"In all cases where a seal is necessary by law to any commission, process, or other instrument provided for by the laws of Congress, it shall be lawful to affix the proper seal by making an impression therewith directly on the paper to which such seal is necessary; which shall be as valid as if made on wax or other adhesive substance."

Even though a "Writ of Order," a "Writ of Judgment," a "Writ of Summons," a "Writ of Warrant," a "Writ of Mandamus," a "Writ of Injunction," and a "Writ of Error" are rarely used consistently, the term "writs and process issuing from a court of the United States ...", when referring to any written instrument issued by either the Supreme Court of the United States, or any court established and ordained by an Act of Congress under Article III of the Constitution; for any such written instrument(s) to be valid, said instrument(s) must be authenticated by the impressed seal of the court and countersigned by the Clerk of the Court, pursuant to the Acts of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1691 and 1 U.S.C. §114.

Accordingly, any "Writ of Order," "Writ of Judgment,"

"Writ of Summons," "Writ of Warrant," "Writ of Mandamus,"
"Writ of Injunction," "Writ of Error," or any other
instrument, including but not limited to a "Writ of Judgment
in a Criminal Case," rendered by a "district court of
the United States" constituted under Chapter 5 of Title
28 U.S.C. §81, et. seq., rendered and filed without
authentication in the nature of the impressed seal of
the court, and countersigned by the clerk of the court
as mandated by the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C.
§1691 and 1 U.S.C. §114, is therefore NULL AND VOID, and
a Legal Nullity.

### DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 8]:

It is therefore Declared that the provisions of the Acts of Congress evidenced at 1 U.S.C. §114 and 28 U.S.C. §1691, establish that any writ or process, that being any written Order, Judgment, Decree, Summons, Warrant, including a "Judgment in a Criminal Case," issued by any court of the United States, as defined by the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §451, is NULL AND VOID, without legal force or effect, and a <a href="Legal Nullity">Legal Nullity</a>, when issued and filed without being authenticated by the impressed seal of the court and countersigned by the clerk of the court.

//

//

QUESTION 9:

Are Judgments rendered by any "court of the United States" in violation of the Constitution, without Jurisdiction of the Parties, without Jurisdiction of the Subject Matter, in violation of the Acts of Congress, or in violation of Due Process of Law, VOID, without legal force or effect, and thus <u>Legal Nullities</u>?

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 9:

The provisions of the Constitution at the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments establish that the inhabitants of both the United States and the several states of the Union have an absolute right not to be deprived of any liberty, property, or life, without Due Process of Law; and thereby renders any Judgment issued by any court of the United States VOID, when issued in violation of the Constitution; without Jurisdiction of the Parties; without Jurisdiction of the Subject Matter; rendered in violation of the Acts of Congress; which is therefore rendered in violation of Due Process of Law, in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; and thus VOID, without force or effect, and Legal Nullities. As such, Judgments are rendered in violation of the Supreme Law of the Land, as identified at Article VI, Clause 2.

The several states of the Union in Congress, as evidenced by and through legislation at 28 U.S.C. §2255(a),

designated that when a Judgment rendered by a district court is VOID with regard to a "Judgment in a Criminal Case," 28 U.S.C. §2255(a) states the following:

Motion Attacking Sentence: "A prisoner in custody under sentence of a court established by Act of Congress claiming the right to be released upon the ground that the sentence was imposed in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or that the court was without jurisdiction to impose such sentence, or that the sentence was in excess of the maximum authorized by law, or is otherwise subject to collateral attack, may move the court which imposed the sentence to vacate, set aside, or correct the sentence."

### DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 9]:

It is therefore Declared that the provisions of the Constitution at the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, establish that the inhabitants of both the Federal Government of the United States and of the several states of the Union, have the inherent right not to be deprived of any liberty, property, or life, without Due Process of Law, and renders any Judgment rendered by any court of the United States VOID, when issued in violation of the Constitution or Laws of the United States; when rendered without Jurisdiction of the Parties; when rendered without Jurisdiction of the Subject Matter; and said Judgment

24

25

26

27

28

is therefore rendered in violation of Due Process of Law; and thereby is in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States; and thus are VOID, without legal force or effect, and are Legal Nullities, as such Judgments are rendered in violation of the Supreme Law of the Land, as identified at Article VI, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

#### QUESTION 10:

Do the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clauses 17 and 18; Article IV; Article VI, Clause 2; and the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution; as well as the Acts of Congress, specifically the Act evidenced at 40 U.S.C.  $\S 3112$ , recognize the several states of the Union as independent Constitutional Republics, with their own Governments comprised of Executive Departments, Legislative Departments, and Judicial Departments; and as foreign states in relation to Federal States; including and limited to the Federal State of the District of Columbia, the Federal State Territories, the Federal State Commonwealths, the Federal State Possessions; and the Federal State Enclaves; making all Judgments, Decrees, Orders, Rulings, and Opinions rendered by Federal Courts of the United States, foreign judgments with regard to the several states of the Union; and when applying such foreign Federal Court Judgments within the territorial borders of any of the several states of the Union against any of the inhabitants of any one

of the several states of the Union outside of any Federal Enclave, this renders such Judgments, Decrees, Orders, Rulings and Opinions, including but not limited to "Judgments in a Criminal Case" thoroughly repugnant to the Constitution, VOID, without any force or effect, and a <u>Legal Nullity</u>?

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 10:

Article VI, Clause 2, <u>Supreme Law</u>, provides that:
"This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be found thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."

As the Constitution is primarily the Supreme Law of the Land, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, establishes that the whole of the Federal Government, all Departments of the Federal Government, and all Officers of all Departments of the Federal Government, are subject to the express and absolute authority of the several states of the Union in Congress, to wit:

"The Congress [the several states of the Union by and through their respective Representatives and Senators] shall have the Power ... To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers [Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 through 17], and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof." (emphasis added).

Congress expressed the understanding that the several states of the Union in Congress, collectively are vested with the absolute and exclusive authority over all of the Federal Government of the United States and all Offices of the Federal Government of the United States, at the Act of Congress evidenced at 50 U.S.C. §1541(b), as follows:

"Congressional Legislative Power Under Necessary
and Proper Clause: Under Article I, Section 8, of the
Constitution, it is specifically provided that the Congress
shall have the power to make all laws necessary and proper
for carrying into execution, not only its own powers but
also all other powers vested by the Constitution in the
Government of the United States, or in any department
or officer thereof."

The provisions of the Tenth Amendment establish that the powers of the Federal Government are limited to only those powers specifically delegated to the Federal Government in writing, by the Constitution, as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by
the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States,
are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

(emphasis added).

The Supreme Law of the Land, pursuant to Article
I, Section 8, Clause 18, and the Tenth Amendment, limit
the Constitutional authority of the Federal Government
of the United States to only those powers delegated to
the Federal Government which have been carried into execution
by the several states of the Union in Congress by legislation.
All other powers remain dormant.

As the Supreme Law of the Land, the Federal Government may only exercise power vested by the Constitution of the United States at the pleasure of the several states of the Union; acting in their sovereign collective authority in Congress. The several states of the Union have the power to rescind any power vested by the Constitution in the Federal Government of the United States, its Departments, and Officers.

The several states of the Union, Declared to the world in the Declaration of Independence that the states of the Union are countries, equal to all other countries of the world, to wit:

"We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States, in general Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by the Authority of the good people of the United Colonies are, and of Right,

. 

 ought to be Free and Independent States; that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy war, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. ---".

It must be noted that in the context of the Declaration of Independence, that the Nation of Great Britain is denoted as "the State of Great Britain," denoting that the term:
"State" in the context of the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution of the United States, means independent country or nation.

The several states of the Union, in Congress, established in the context of the Acts of Congress, by the Act evidenced at 22 U.S.C. §456, that the term: "state", when styled with a lower case "s", indicates nation, government, and country, to wit:

22 U.S.C. §456(e): <u>Definitions</u>: "The term "state" shall include [and is limited to] nation, government, and country." (emphasis added).

Furthermore, in 22 U.S.C. §2200b(c)(3), this Act of Congress established that in the context of the Acts of Congress, that when the term: "state" is styled with a capital "S", the term: "State" includes and is limited

. 

to the District of Columbia and any Federal Commonwealth,
Federal Territory, or Federal Possession of the United
States, to wit:

22 U.S.C.  $\S 2200b(c)(3)$ : "the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States."

In the context of the Acts of Congress, the term:
"State", when styled with a capital "S", indicates all
locations subject to the Territorial, Legislative, and
Judicial Jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the
United States.

As evidenced by the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, Article IV of the Constitution as well as the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, these establish the recognition that each and every state of the Union is an independent Constitutional Republic, with its own Constitution, and government comprised of an Executive Department, a Legislative Department, and a Judicial Department. Its own citizens are recognized by the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, regarding the citizenship of the state of residence, and its own military in the nature of the state National Guard, making the states of the Union in fact nations.

The Constitution recognizes that the several states are foreign to each other by and through the provisions

. 

. 

of Article IV; and that each state has its own citizens at Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1, <u>Privileges and Immunities of Citizens</u>, which provides that "The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States."

Pursuant to the provisions of the Declaration of
Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the provisions
of the Constitution at Article I, Section 8, Clause 18,
Article IV, and the Tenth Amendment; the states, upon
joining the Union, retain all sovereign powers as
independent nation/states, and upon joining, agree to
exercise certain aspects of national powers collectively
by and through the states' representatives and senators
in Congress, as exemplified by Article I, Section 8, Clauses
1 through 18; and agree to refrain from the exercise of
certain sovereign powers, especially with regard to not
making or enforcing any laws abridging the rights, privileges,
or immunities of the citizens and/or inhabitants of their
states, as exemplified by the Fourteenth Amendment.

Upon establishing the Federal Government, the several states of the Union did not, at any time, surrender any sovereign powers to the Federal Government, but retained absolute and exclusive power over the Federal Government, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; vesting absolute and exclusive power in the several states of the Union over all power vested by the Constitution in the Federal

Government of the United States.

I

In order to ensure that the collective authority of the several states of the Union could not be applied or enforced within the territorial limits of any of the sister states of the Union, Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, and Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, Territory or Property of the United States, limits the application and enforcement of Federal Legislative Authority, exclusively to the District of Columbia, the Federal Territories, the Federal Commonwealths, the Federal Possessions, and Federal Enclaves within the several states.

Congress did not enact legislation to implement the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, in order to establish Federal Enclaves in the several states of the Union, until the year 1940. The Act of Congress evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112, evidenced that the several states of the Union in Congress, exercised the power vested by Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, to carry into execution the power vested in Congress at Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, to establish Federal Enclaves in the several states of the Union, that would be subject to exclusive Territorial, Legislative, and Judicial Jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the United States.

Until 1940, no Federal Enclave subject to Federal Territorial, Legislative, or Judicial Jurisdiction existed

within the several states of the Union; as the power to establish Federal Enclaves had yet to be carried into execution by the several states of the Union in Congress.

I

Prior to 1940, it was not lawful to apply or enforce any Federal Law within the Territorial Jurisdiction of any of the several states of the Union, as there were no Federal Enclaves in any of the states of the Union.

Prior to 1940, the provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1332, provides that the United States District Court Jurisdiction in diversity of citizenship cases, limited jurisdiction to citizens of different states. However, at 28 U.S.C. §1332(e), Congress defined the word "States" styled with a capital "S" in the context of the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1332, to mean exclusively the following: "The word "States," as used in this section, includes the Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico," with all of these locations subject to the Territorial, Legislative, and Judicial Jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the United States.

United States Attorney Philip F. Herrick of Puerto Rico, made a written observation of the challenge created by the provisions of the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1332 in the History and Ancillary Laws of 28 U.S.C. §1332, as follows:

"The revised section conforms with the views of Philip

F. Herrick, United States Attorney, Puerto Rico, who observed that the act of April 20, 1940, permitted action between a citizen of Hawaii and of Puerto Rico, but not between a citizen of New York and Puerto Rico, in the district court."

In order to include citizens of the several states of the Union, the 1940 Amendment established a new definition at Subsection (b) of the 1940 Amendment, extending the authority to entertain controversies between citizens of the Territories of the District of Columbia and foreign states, and citizens or subjects thereof, including citizens of the several states of the Union as citizens of a foreign state to the Federal Government.

Now appearing as 28 U.S.C. §1332(a)(2), evidence of the Act of Congress states: "(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs, and is between --- (2) citizens of a State and citizens or subjects of a foreign state..."

The several states of the Union, as independent sovereign Constitutional Republics with their own independent governments and citizens, are foreign states unto each other; and individually and collectively foreign to the Federal Government of the United States.

23

24

20

21

22

25

26

27

28

All Judgments issued by any court of the United States, including but not limited to "Judgments in a Criminal Case" issued by United States District Courts located within the territorial borders of the several states of the Union, as well as Judgments issued by the United States Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of the United States, are foreign judgments with regard to the several states of the Union; and when applied or enforced within the territorial limits of a sovereign state of the Union outside a Federal Enclave against any inhabitant of any one of the several states of the Union, is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, as such foreign judgments would be applied and enforced in violation of the Constitutional limits imposed by Article I, Section 8, Clause 17; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2; and the Tenth Amendment; rendering such Judgments, including but not limited to "Judgments in a Criminal Case," NULL AND VOID without legal force or effect, and Legal Nullities with regard to the several states of the Union.

The provisions of Article VI, Clause 2, establishing what comprises the Supreme Law of the Land, provides:

"Supreme Law: This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound

thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The fact is that Article VI, Clause 3, Oath of Office, requires that "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States."

Inasmuch as the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2; as well as the Tenth and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States; and the Act of Congress evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112, limit the application and enforcement of any Act of the Federal Congress of the United States to only the District of Columbia, the Federal Territories, the Federal Commonwealths, the Federal Possessions, and Federal Enclaves established after 1940; and that Article VI, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that the Judges. in every state is bound to the Supreme Law of the Land, and that anything in the Constitution or Laws of any state to the contrary is notwithstanding; it is therefore the duty of the Judges of the several states of the Union, notwithstanding any provision of the state constitution(s) or laws to the contrary, to prevent or aid in the prevention of the application and/or enforcement of any Federal Law,

Federal Ordinance, Federal Regulation, Federal Custom,

Federal Usage, and all Federal Court Judgments, against

any citizen or inhabitant of the several states of the

Union, outside any Federal Enclave located in the states

of the Union established since 1940, as such application

and/or enforcement of any Federal Law, Federal Ordinance,

"Judgments in a Criminal Case:" rendered by a United States

Federal Regulation, Federal Custom, Federal Usage, and

Federal Court Judgments, including but not limited to

District Court located in any one of the several states

of the Union, are indeed foreign laws and court judgments

and immunities of the citizens and/or inhabitants of the

several states of the Union under the pretense and color

of Federal Law; inasmuch as those rights, privileges and

immunities are protected by the Constitution and the Laws

of the United States. Thus, the Foreign Judgments of Federal

outside Federal Enclaves that are repugnant to the Constitution

of the United States, and act to abridge the rights, privileges

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Courts, including "Judgments in a Criminal Case," are VOID, without lawful force or effect, and are thereby Legal Nullities

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 10]:

It is therefore Declared that Article I, Section 8, Clauses 17 and 18; Article IV; Article VI, Clause 2 as well as the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution and the Acts of Congress, specifically and particularly the Act

evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112, recognize the several states

of the Union as independent Constitutional Republics, each

with their own governments that are comprised of Executive,

to the Federal State of the District of Columbia; the Federal

making all Judgments, Decrees, Orders, Rulings and Opinions

rendered by Federal Courts of the United States as foreign

within the territorial borders of any of the several states

of the Union against any of the citizens and/or inhabitants

judgments with regard to the several states of the Union;

and when applying such foreign Federal Court Judgments

of the several states of the Union outside any Federal

Enclave, renders such foreign Federal Court Judgments,

Decrees, Orders, Rulings and Opinions, including but not

States District Court located within the borders of any

one of the several states of the Union, to be repugnant

to the Constitution of the United States, and thus VOID,

without any legal force or effect, and Legal Nullities.

limited to "Judgments in a Criminal Case" issued by a United

Legislative, and Judicial Departments; as foreign states

in relation to the Federal States; including and limited

State Territories; the Federal State Commonwealths; the

Federal State Possessions, and Federal State Enclaves;

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### QUESTION 11:

When brought to the attention of the Judge that rendered a Judgment that is VOID, or when such VOID Judgment is brought to the attention of any other Judge where such

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Judgment is the subject of attention, because said VOID Judgment was rendered in violation of the Constitution; or rendered without jurisdiction of the parties; or rendered without jurisdiction of the subject matter; or rendered in violation of a statute; or rendered in violation of Due Process of Law, is such Judge required to vacate such VOID Judgment and purge the record?

# BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 11:

The several states of the Union, by and through the express Act of Legislation evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2071, et. seq., Rule-Making Power Generally, vested the Supreme Court of the United States and all courts established by Acts of Congress with the power to prescribe rules of procedure for the courts, including rules of procedure for evidence, which must be approved by the several states of the Union in Congress by the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2074, Rules of Procedure and Evidence; Submission to Congress, Effective Date, making all rules of procedure prescribed by the Supreme Court and courts established by Acts of Congress, by extension, an Act of Congress.

Since a Judgment rendered by a court of the United States (1) in violation of the Constitution; (2) in violation of an Act of Congress; (3) without Jurisdiction of the Parties; (4) without Jurisdiction of the Subject Matter; (5) in violation of Due Process of law, is NULL AND VOID,

without lawful force or effect, and thus a <u>Legal Nullity</u>, such judgments can <u>never</u> become final; and are not subject to res judicata, laches, or estoppel, and can be challenged at any time.

The provisions of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments establishing the protection for the right not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without Due Process of Law, clearly establishes that any Judgment rendered by a Federal or state court, in violation of the Constitution; in violation of statute; without jurisdiction of the parties or of the subject matter, violates Due Process of Law, and therefore, the Federal or state court lacks the authority/jurisdiction to issue any Judgment depriving a party of any right to life, liberty, or property.

The provisions of the First Amendment of the Constitution establish the protections of the inherent right to petition for redress of grievances, or in this case, to petition for relief from the effects of a VOID JUDGMENT.

In keeping with the mandates of the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2071, et. seq., the Supreme Court and courts established by Acts of Congress have established rules of procedure to aid in addressing and securing relief from VOID JUDGMENTS rendered in violation of the Constitution; in violation of statute; in violation of Due Process of Law; and without jurisdiction of the parties or without jurisdiction of the subject matter.

For civil actions, the Supreme Court established the

procedures to initially challenge the presumption of 12(b)(1),

of Territorial Jurisdiction]; 12(b)(4), insufficient process

particularly at Rule 12, Defenses and Objections, provides

lack of subject-matter jurisdiction; 12(b)(2), lack of

personal jurisdiction; 12(b)(3), improper venue / [lack

[Due Process violation]; 12(b)(5), insufficient service

of process [denial of notice and opportunity to respond];

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Specifically and

12(b)(6), failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted [i.e.: lack of Article III standing]; and: 12(b)(7), failure to join a party under Rule 19.

At Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3), the rule of law is: "Lack of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction. If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action."

It is clear that pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3), it is a mandatory, non-discretionary duty of the court to dismiss an action, which would of necessity require the Judgment rendered in such action to be vacated as VOID, when it is found that the Court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction of the case.

For civil actions, the Supreme Court provided a Due Process procedure to secure relief from a VOID Judgment at Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4), which provides:

"On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reason[]: (4) the judgment is **VOID**. (emphasis added).

It should be noted that the time limitations for petitioning for relief from judgment by motion apply only to those reasons presented in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1), (2), and (3). There is no time limit to secure relief from a VOID JUDGMENT(S), as such Judgments, being Legal Nullities, never become final. Such a motion under 60(b)(4) is an extension of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b) and 12(h)(3), requiring the mandatory vacating of a Judgment, and dismissing the action for want of subject matter jurisdiction.

For criminal actions, the Supreme Court provides at Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 12(b)(2) that: "A motion that the court lacks jurisdiction may be made at any time while the case is pending."

The Supreme Court provided the initial opportunity to secure relief from a VOID Judgment in a Criminal Case at Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 34, entitled: "[Motion to] Arrest[] Judgment,", stating at (a): "Upon the defendant's motion or on its own, the court must arrest judgment if the court does not have jurisdiction of the charged offense."

While the provisions of Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure

34(b) limit the time that a defendant may bring a motion, there is no time limit on the court; and the Rule imposes a mandatory, non-discretionary requirement on the court to arrest/vacate a judgment if the court does not have jurisdiction of the charged offense, on its own motion.

The several states of the Union established an additional opportunity to secure relief from a Judgment in a Criminal Case, although limited to the issue of the sentence imposed, evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2255; and the Supreme Court established Rules of Procedure to present a petition for remedy and relief from a sentence imposed by a United States District Court in a Criminal Case.

As evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2255(a), this Act provides that: "A prisoner in custody under <u>sentence</u> of a court established by Act of Congress claiming the right to be released upon the ground that the sentence was imposed in violation of the Constitution or Laws of the United States, or that the court was without jurisdiction to impose such sentence, or that the sentence was in excess of the maximum authorized by law, or is otherwise subject to collateral attack, may move the court which imposed the sentence to vacate, set aside[,] or correct the sentence." (emphasis added).

It should be noted that prior to the 1996 Amendment, the Act read: "A motion for relief may be made at any time,"

which clearly recognizes the fact that a sentence, being an integral part of a Judgment when such Judgment is VOID because it is rendered in violation of the Constitution or Laws of the United States without Jurisdiction or in violation of Due Process of Law, renders such a Judgment not subject to any statute of limitations, laches, res judicata, or estoppel. Erroneously, the current one year limitation period for 28 U.S.C. §2255 filings after a judgment is final, assumes that a VOID JUDGMENT can ever be final, since a VOID JUDGMENT is and would have been VOID ab initio.

Since VOID JUDGMENTS are <u>Legal Nullities</u>, it is <u>not</u> possible for a VOID JUDGMENT to <u>ever</u> be final. Consequently, if the provisions are applied to address a VOID JUDGMENT rather than an error in sentencing, the time limitation period of the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2255(f) would not apply; and in effect be comparable to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4).

Instead, the provisions of the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C.  $\S2255$ , addressing exclusively the issue of the sentence, is comparable to and with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1), (2), and (3), which imposes a one year time limitation period from when the Judgment becomes final.

The provisions of the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2255 fail to afford remedy to secure relief from a VOID "Judgment in a Criminal Case." However, as addressed by the Supreme

23

24

25

26

27

28

Court in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(d), nothing in either the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings, prevent any court of the United States from entertaining an independent action to relieve a party from a Judgment, Order, or Proceeding.

Since Judgments rendered in violation of the Constitution and Laws of the United States that are or have been rendered without jurisdiction, or rendered in violation of Due Process of Law, thereby rendering a "Judgment in a Criminal Case" VOID, without force or effect, and thus a Legal Nullity, thus preventing the "Judgment in a Criminal Case" from ever becoming final, keeping the Federal Criminal Case ongoing and perpetually pending since statutes of limitations, res judicata, laches or estoppel have no force or effect, this allows the party against whom such a VOID "Judgment in a Criminal Case" to seek relief at any time from such a VOID Judgment, by filing a motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2), a motion under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 34, or file a separate action. Judge who rendered the VOID JUDGMENT, on his or her own motion, sua sponte, must vacate the VOID JUDGMENT, and purge the record.

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 11]:

It is therefore Declared that when brought to the

attention of the Judge that rendered a Judgment that is VOID, or when brought to the attention of any other Judge wherein such Judgment is the subject of consideration, because it was rendered in violation of the Constitution, or rendered in violation of any statute, or rendered without jurisdiction of the parties; or rendered without jurisdiction of the subject matter; or rendered in violation of Due Process of Law; the Judge that rendered the VOID JUDGMENT, or other reviewing Judge who, when it becomes known that such Judgment is VOID, has the mandatory and non-discretionary duty and obligation to vacate such VOID JUDGMENT, and purge the record.

#### QUESTION 12:

Do the provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, and 42 U.S.C. §1986, enforcing the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, prohibit the Federal Government of the United States and the governments of the several states of the Union, from making or enforcing any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States, and/or any other person(s) within the Territorial Jurisdiction of the United States; thereby subjecting Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government; who, while acting in their individual and private capacity(ies), causes or subjects any party within the Territorial Jurisdiction

of the United States or elsewhere, to be subjected to conspiracy under color of law to violate any of said party's rights which are protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, thereby creating an action of liability on behalf of the party damaged, for money damages and other relief?

## BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 12:

The provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, provides that: "... No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, "Power to Enforce Amendment," provides that the several states of the Union, in Congress, has the exclusive, absolute power, by legislation, to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment, as follows:

"The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

It cannot be overly stressed that the Judges of the Article III Judicial Department do <u>not</u> possess any Constitutional law-making powers; and as such, Judicial

Decrees cannot be construed as substitutes for Acts of Congress.

Furthermore, inasmuch as all Judgments, Decrees, Rulings and Opinions of any Federal Judge, whether it be a Supreme Court Justice, an Appellate Court Judge, a District Court Judge, or any other Federal Judge, which has been rendered in violation of the Constitution; rendered in violation of an Act of Congress; rendered without Jurisdiction over the parties or over the subject matter; or rendered in violation of Due Process of Law, are VOID without force or effect, and are therefore <a href="Legal Nullities">Legal Nullities</a>. Whether such judgments have yet to be challenged does not alter the fact that such VOID JUDGMENTS are in fact <a href="Legal Nullities">Legal Nullities</a>.

In order to avoid the possibility of reliance on VOID

JUDGMENTS [Legal Nullities] which comprise much of Federal

Judicial Case Precedent, the provisions of the Supreme

Law of the Land have been relied upon and will be relied upon

in all of Questions 1 through 19 Demanded, so that and in order

to establish the basis of and for the Declaratory Judgment

Demanded and to be Determined as a condition precendent

for further relief will not be relying on Judicial Precedent.

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, and the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, by and through legislation, acted to enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment,

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

Section 1, as evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1981, 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, 42 U.S.C. §1986; and 18 U.S.C. §241 and 18 U.S.C. §242. The initial "Federal Civil Rights Act," 42 U.S.C. §1981, Equal Rights Under the Law, was based on the Act of May 31, 1870, Chapter 114, Section 16, 16 Statute 114, and formerly appeared as 8 U.S.C. §41. U.S.C. §1983, Civil Action For Deprivation Of Rights, was based on the Act of April 20, 1871, Chapter 22, Section 1, 17 Statute 13, and formerly appeared as 8 U.S.C. §43. 42 U.S.C. §1985, Conspiracy To Interfere With Civil Rights, was based on the Act of July 31, 1861, Chapter 33, 12 Statute 284; and April 20, 1871, Chapter 22, Section 2, 17 Statute 13, and formerly appeared as 8 U.S.C. §47. 42 U.S.C. §1986, Action For Neglect To Prevent Conspiracy, was based on the Act of April 20, 1871, Chapter 22, Section 6, 17 Statute 15, and formerly appeared as 8 U.S.C. §48.

The Act evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §241, Conspiracy Against Rights, was based on the Act of March 4, 1989, Chapter 321, Section 19, 35 Statute 1092. 18 U.S.C. §242, Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law, was based on the Act of March 4, 1909, Chapter 31, Section 20, 35 Statute 1092.

These acts establish that it is both a civil and a criminal act of misconduct to conspire under color of law, or to otherwise deprive anyone within the Territorial Jurisdiction of the Federal Government of any right protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States.

The provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at

. 

42 U.S.C. §1983, Civil Action For Deprivation of Rights, states:

"Every person who, under color of any statute, ordingulation, custom.

"Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, or any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable...." (emphasis added).

Furthermore, the provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1985(3), <u>Depriving Persons of Rights or Privileges</u>, states:

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire, or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws ... in any case of conspiracy set forth in this section, if one or more persons engaged therein

do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property, or deprived of having and exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages, occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators."

The provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §241, Conspiracy Against Rights, states:

"If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured -- They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both...." (emphasis added).

Additionally, the provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §242, <u>Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law</u>, states:

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in

23

24

25

26

27

28

any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or Laws of the United States, ... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping [unlawful imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §1201] or an attempt to kidnap, ... shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death." (emphasis added).

The Acts of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, 18 U.S.C. §241 and 18 U.S.C. §242, establish that any person (in his or her private and individual capacity) can be held either to civil liability or criminal liability for violating any right protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States.

The Act of Congress as exemplified by 42 U.S.C. §1983, does <u>not</u> read: "Every Officer, Agent, or Employee of the Federal Government of the United States, or Officer, Agent, or Employee of any government of the several states of

6 7

5

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

2324

25 26

27

28

the Union, acting within the scope of said Officer's, Agent's, or Employee's office or employment with either the government of the United States or the government of any of the several states of the Union, under the lawful authority of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage..."

For the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1870 and 1871 to have applied to Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Government in their official capacity(ies), in keeping with the limits and/or limitations to legislative authority imposed on the Federal Legislative Department at Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, it would require the existence of a vested Constitutional power before any legislation would be enacted in order to carry such powers into execution. Therefore, there would had to have been a Constitutional power vesting the Departments of the Government of the United States and their Officers, Agents, and Employees with the authority to violate the protected rights of the people under the authority of Federal or state law: There has never been any such authority.

Since the Government of the United States as well as the governments of the several states of the Union are Constitutional Republics, the Constitutional limits imposed on both the entities of the Government of the United States and the governments of the several states of the Union from making or enforcing any law which would abridge the immunities of the people (which Congress has determined

of the United States pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment], these Constitutional limits make it a <u>legal impossibility</u> for the Government of the United States or the governments of the several states of the Union, as well as <u>any</u> Officer, Agent, or Employee of either the Government of the United States or the governments of the several states of the Union, while acting in their official capacity(ies) within the scope of their respective office or employment with the Government, to violate <u>any</u> right protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States.

Instead, the provisions of the Acts of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983 and 42 U.S.C. §1985, establish that only persons [one, two, or more], acting in their individual and private capacity(ies), who subject anyone to violations of any right(s) protected by the Constitution of the United States, are liable to the injured party for the recovery of damages.

The Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, establishes the act of violating any right protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States, is an act "under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia..."

Congress qualifies the act to be under <u>color of law</u>.

Congress did <u>not</u> say under any statute, but <u>under color</u>

of any statute. The use of "color of law" is quite significant.

Using Black's Law Dictionary to assist in understanding the intent of the term "color of statute (law)," it will become clear as to the actual intent of Congress.

Black's Law Dictionary, Tenth Edition (2014), Page 322, Color of Law (17c) is defined as: "The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of a legal right. The term usually implies a misuse of power made possible because the wrongdoer is clothed with the authority of the state. State action is synonymous with color of [state] law in the context of federal civil-rights statutes or criminal law. See: State Actions."

Since the Constitution prohibits both the Federal Government and state governments from making or enforcing any law abridging the protected rights of the people, Congress recognized that from time to time, Officers, Agents and Employees would violate the protected rights of the people by the unconstitutional application and enforcement of the laws, statutes, ordinances, regulations, custom, or usage; and in doing so, these violators would be acting within the scope of their individual and private capacity(ies) under the color (pretense) of law, not under the authority of law; thus making the provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983 applicable to every person,

not every government officer, agent, or employee.

As the Constitution prohibits the Federal Government and state governments from making or enforcing any laws violating any right protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States, neither the Government of the United States, nor the government of the several states of the Union, nor any political subdivision can be construed to be a "person" within the context of the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, or 42 U.S.C. §1986, as no government entity or political subdivision can act under color of law, or conspire with others to act under color of law in order to violate the protected rights of the people.

As legal entities established by legal documents, governments cannot independently get up from the paper that creates their existence and act under the pretense of Constitutional authority or color of Constitutional Law and violate the protected rights of anyone. Only living persons can violate the protected rights of other living persons under the pretense of legal authority, and only within their respective individual and private capacity(ies).

The provisions of the Constitution at Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 and Clause 18, as well as the Tenth Amendment, limit the legislative authority of the Federal Government to either the implementing or the rescinding of powers

vested by the Constitution of the United States in the

application and enforcement of the Acts of Congress to

the Insular Possessions, the Federal Commonwealths, and

vested at Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, establishing

Federal Enclaves in the several states of the Union, was

not carried into execution until 1940 by and through the

states of the Union, subject to Federal, Territorial,

Legislative and Judicial Jurisdiction was dormant, and

the borders of the several states of the Union prior to

1940, the power to establish Federal Enclaves in the several

therefore no Federal Territorial Jurisdiction existed within

Act of Congress evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112.

the Federal Enclaves located in the several states of the

Government of the United States, and limit the territorial

the seat of the Federal Government, the Federal Territories,

It must be noted that the Constitutional power

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1940.

The provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, which state in part: "Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia ..."; and in the Act of Congress evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §242, which states in part: "Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth,

Possession, or District ..."; establish the legislative

intent as to the territorial application of the provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Act in order to redress the act of civil and criminal misconduct of subjecting any party to the violation of rights, privileges, and immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or the Laws of the United States.

The issue of committing acts under color of law must be noted, since Congress firmly established the civil and criminal act of misconduct in this context under pretense of legal authority, not under actual authority of any law.

As evidenced by both 42 U.S.C. §1983 and 18 U.S.C. §242, Congress includes the term "State" with the word "State" styled with a capital "S", along with the terms: "Territory" and "District of Columbia" in 42 U.S.C. §1983, clearly identifying territorial locations exclusively subject to Federal Territorial and Legislative Jurisdiction. In 18 U.S.C. §242, Congress included the terms: "Territory," "Commonwealth," "Possession" or "District" along with the term "State," once again clearly identifying territorial locations exclusively subject to Federal Territorial and Legislative Jurisdiction.

It should be unequivocally clear that by enacting the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983 and 18 U.S.C. §242, Congress complied with the territorial limits imposed by the Constitution of the United States at Article I, Section

 8, Clauses 17 and 18, as well as the Tenth Amendment, as implemented in 1940 by the Act of Congress evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112, on the legislative authority of the Federal Government, limiting the legislative territorial jurisdiction to the Federal Seat of Government: The District of Columbia; the Federal Territories, the Federal Commonwealths, the Federal Insular Possessions, and the Federal District which are comprised of Federal Enclaves when located in the several states of the Union; by using the terms: "Territory" and "District of Columbia" in the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983; and by using the terms: "Territory," "Commonwealth," "Possession," or "District" in the Act of Congress evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §242.

The question now to be addressed is whether Congress, by including the term "State" styled with a capital "S", intended to expand the legislative territorial jurisdiction of the Federal Government into the several states of the Union with regard to the provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, 42 U.S.C. §1986, 18 U.S.C. §241 and 18 U.S.C. §242; all in direct violation of the express limits to Federal Territorial Legislative Jurisdiction imposed by Article I, Section 8, Clauses 17 and 18, as well as the Tenth Amendment.

In order to resolve the question as to whether by including the term: "Staté" styled with a capital "S" in the Federal Civil Rights Act evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983

and 18 U.S.C. §242, Congress intended the Federal Civil Rights Act to be applied within the territorial jurisdiction of the several states of the Union. The legislative definitions established by Acts of Congress with regard to the term "State" that have been styled with a capital "S" must be addressed in order to determine the scope and extent of the intended Territorial Legislative Jurisdiction when the term: "State" styled with a capital "S" is applied within the context of Federal Legislation.

In order for Congress to have made the provisions of the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, 42 U.S.C. §1986, 18 U.S.C. §241 and 18 U.S.C. §242 applicable to officers, agents and employees of a state of the Union, who while acting in their individual and private capacity(ies), conspired under color of the laws of the state of the Union to violate the protected rights of an inhabitant of the same state, there first must be Constitutional authority vested in the Judicial Department to consider controversies between citizens of the same state. If that were so, then Congress would have been required, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, to enact the required legislation to implement such judicial power.

Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, <u>Subjects of Jurisdiction</u>, establishes the subjects of jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, as follows:

"The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority; -- to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls; -- to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; -- to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party; -- to Controversies between two or more States; -- between a State and Citizens of another State; -- between Citizens of different States, -- between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects."

It further needs to be noted that within the context of the Constitution, the term: "State" is styled with a capital "S". Pursuant to the context in which the term "State" is used in the Constitution, and the fact that the Federal Government is identified by the style of process: "United States," and foreign nations are identified by the term: "foreign state," the term: "State" styled with a capital "S" in the Constitutional context means exclusively one of the states of the Union.

As evidenced by Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, the Judicial Power of the United States does not extend to cases or controversies between citizens or inhabitants of the same state of the Union, except exclusively for

the limited controversies involving land claims under Grants of different states. Therefore, it is a <u>legal impossibility</u> for the provisions of the Acts of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, 42 U.S.C. §1986, 18 U.S.C. §241 and 18 U.S.C. §242 to apply to officers, agents, and employees of the several states of the Union, who, while acting in their individual capacity(ies), conspire under color of the laws of a state of the Union to violate the protected rights of an inhabitant of the same state; as there exists no Constitutional authority for the Federal Judicial Department to take jurisdiction of a case or controversy between citizens/inhabitants of the same state.

For further clarification of the general Congressional intent for the meaning of the term: "State" styled with a capital "S" in the context of the Acts of Congress, by the Act evidenced at 4 U.S.C. §110(d), "The term "State" includes any Territory or possession of the United States." Congress limited the meaning of the term: "State" styled with a capital "S" to only Federal Territories or Possessions, both subject to the Territorial and Legislative Jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the United States.

By enacting legislation to carry into execution the powers vested in the Judicial Department at Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, Subjects of Jurisdiction, Congress, pursuant to the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1331, Federal Question, carried into execution of Constitutional Judicial

Power by stating: "The Judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made..." Congress clearly carried out its authority and power vested by Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, by and through the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1331, which states: "The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States," as the Supreme Law of the Land, in keeping with Article VI, Clause 2, Supreme Law.

The Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1332,

Diversity of Citizenship; Amount in Controversy; Costs,
is where Congress carried into execution the Constitutional

Judicial Powers vested at Article III, Section 2, Clause 1,

Subjects of Jurisdiction, cited hereinabove, supra. The

provisions of the Eleventh Amendment, Suits Against States

-- Restriction of Judicial Power, terminated the Judicial

power in cases "commenced or prosecuted against one of

the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens

or Subjects of any Foreign State." After the ratification

of the Eleventh Amendment, the Federal Judicial Department

no longer had Constitutional authority of any suit in law

or equity filed by a Citizen of another State, or Citizens

or Subjects of any Foreign State, against one of the several

states of the Union.

That aside, by the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1332, Congress carried into execution those judicial powers vested by Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, as required by the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

The provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1332(e), clearly established the general Congressional intent for the meaning of the term: "State" styled with a capital "S" in the context of the acts carrying the Judicial Power and Jurisdiction of the United States into execution. 28 U.S.C. §1332(e) defines the term: "State" styled with a capital "S" as follows:

"(e) The word "States," as used in this section, includes the Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

All locations within the Territorial Legislative
Jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the United States,
when reviewing the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C.
§1332, must be read with the statutory meaning of the word
"State" styled with a capital "S" as defined within 28
U.S.C. §1332(e).

28 U.S.C. §1332(a) then must be understood as follows [with explanations in brackets added]:

"(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds

the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between --

- (1) Citizens of different States; ["State" meaning: Federal Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, §1332(e)].
- (2) Citizens of a State and citizens or subjects of a foreign state, except that the district courts shall not have original jurisdiction under this subsection of an action between citizens of a State and citizens or subjects of a foreign state who are lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States and are domiciled in the same State; ["State" meaning: Federal Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, §1332(e)]. Note: If both the citizen of a State and a citizen of a foreign state are both domiciled in the same State: [i.e., a Federal Territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, then the District Court has no jurisdiction].
- (3) Citizens of different States and in which citizens or subjects of a foreign state are additional parties; ["State" meaning: Federal Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, §1332(e)], and:
- (4) A foreign state, defined in section 1603(a) of this title [28 U.S.C. §1603(a), <u>Definitions</u>], as plaintiff

. 

.21 

and citizens of a State or of different States. ["State" meaning: Federal Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico §1332(3)]."

Congress further established its intent for the meaning of the term: "State" when styled with a capital "S" in the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1343, <u>Civil Rights and Elective Franchise</u>, establishing the district courts' jurisdiction of suits brought under the provisions of the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, and 42 U.S.C. §1986.

28 U.S.C. §1343(b) provides that:

- "(b) For purposes of this section --
- (1) The District of Columbia shall be considered to be a State; and:
- (2) Any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia."

When Congress uses the term: "state" styled with a lower case "s", Congress, by and through legislation, as evidenced at 22 U.S.C. §456(e) defines the term: "state" as follows:

"(e) The term "state" shall include nation, government, and country."

Furthermore, at 22 U.S.C. §8541(13), <u>State Sponsor</u> of Terrorism, "The term "state sponsor of terrorism" means any country..."

In the context of the United States Constitution, the term: "State" styled with a capital "S" is intended by the Founders to refer to one of the Constitutional Republics that comprise the Union.

However, in the context of the Acts of Congress as evidenced by the Act at 4 U.S.C. §110(d), 28 U.S.C. §1332(e), and 28 U.S.C. §1343(b), the term: "State" styled with a capital "S" is intended by Congress to refer to a Federal Territory, Federal Possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; all within the Territorial and Legislative Jurisdiction of the United States.

In the context of the Acts of Congress as evidenced at 22 U.S.C. §456(e) and 22 U.S.C. §8541(13), the term: "state" when styled with a lower case "s" is intended to refer to foreign nations, countries, or governments foreign to the Federal Government.

For the provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C.  $\S1332(a)$  to apply to the inhabitants of the several states of the Union, the several states of the Union are referred to as <u>foreign states</u>.

Taking into account the limitations imposed by the

19 20

2122

23

24 25

26 27

28

provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clauses 17 and 18, and the Tenth Amendment, as well as the provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 40 U.S.C. §3112, for Congress to include the term: "State" styled with a capital "S" within the provisions of the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C.  $\S1983$ , et. seq., and 18 U.S.C.  $\S241$  and  $\S242$ , the term: "State" as used in that context requires the existence of exclusive Federal Territorial Legislative Jurisdiction; and since the Federal Congress possesses absolutely no Constitutional authority to subject any of the several states of the Union, with the exception of Federal Enclaves, to any Federal Law, Statute, Regulation, Ordinance or Custom, the term: "State" when used by Congress in the context of the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, et. seq., and 18 U.S.C. §241 and §242, is therefore limited to only the Seat of Federal Government, which is currently the District of Columbia; as well as the Federal Territories, the Federal Commonwealths, the Federal Possessions, and Federal Enclaves.

It must be further noted that at the time that the Federal Civil Rights Act was enacted in 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1981, §1982, §1983, §1985 and §1986; most of the land situated west of the Mississippi River was in fact Federal Territory that at that time was subject to the exclusive Territorial Legislative Jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the United States.

The provisions of the Acts of Congress evidenced at

her private capacity, conspiring with other persons, [pursuant

go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another,

for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly,

42 U.S.C. §1983 and 42 U.S.C. §1985 are companion acts,

due to the fact that any person, while acting in his or

to 42 U.S.C. §1985(3)] "in any State or Territory ... or

any person or class of persons of the equal protection

of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under

the laws ... in any case of conspiracy set forth in this

of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person

or property, or deprived of having and exercising any right or

section, if one or more persons engaged therein do, or

cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object

privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party

so injured may have an action for the recovery of damages,

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I

occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against one or more of the conspirators."

The Acts of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983 and 42 U.S.C. §1985 apply exclusively to Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government of the United States, who elect to enter the several states of the Union in their respective individual and private capacity(ies), under force of arms, outside of any Federal Enclave, and conspire with others to enter the several states of the Union in the disguise of color of Federal Law, Statute, Regulation, Ordinance and Custom, emanating from the District of Columbia,

<u>\*</u> 

while acting under the color or pretense of Federal Authority.

Congress clearly <u>never</u> intended a Federal Law to be applied and enforced against inhabitants of any state in the inhabitants' individual and private capacity(ies).

The several states of the Union have their <u>own</u> civil rights laws in order to address acts of civil and criminal misconduct of state officers, agents, and employees, who under color of the laws of the Constitutional Republics [states] of the Union, conspire to violate the protected rights of an inhabitant of the state.

The determinations of the courts in cases such as Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388, 91 S.Ct. 1999, 29 L.Ed.2d 619 (1971), and its recent progeny within Ziglar v. Abbasi, 101 Cr.L. 295, 315, 198 L.Ed.2d.290, 2017 U.S. LEXIS 3874, (June 19, 2017); and Hernandez v. Mesa, 137 S.Ct. 2003, 198 L.Ed. 625, 2017 U.S. LEXIS 4059 (6/26/2017), that somehow the United States Congress has the Constitutional authority to enact Federal Legislation exclusively applicable only within the several states of the Union, but not applicable to the Federal Government with regard to the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, and 42 U.S.C. §1986; is totally contrary to the limits imposed by Article I, Section 8, Clauses 17 and 18 as well as the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution and the Act of Congress evidenced at

40 U.S.C. §3112.

The effect of such determinations has worked to create the appearance that under and within the provisions of the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, no one whose rights were violated by a person who, while acting under color of Federal Law, meaning under pretense of Federal Law, can file a petition in Federal Court for damages and other relief; and a person whose rights were violated by a person who, while acting under color [pretense] of state law, can file a petition in Federal Court for damages and other relief. This is incorrect, because the Federal Courts lack the Constitutional authority to take jurisdiction of a case between inhabitants of the same state of the Union, thereby leaving the injured party(ies) without any remedy for redress for damages caused by violation of rights under color [or pretense] of law.

The Judgments rendered in <u>Bivens</u>, and the Judgments rendered in cases relying on <u>Bivens</u>, such as <u>Ziglar</u> and <u>Hernandez</u>, [notwithstanding that in the latter two cases, the plaintiffs sued the defendants in their official capacity], are VOID and without legal force or effect, and stand as <u>Legal Nullities</u>; since said Judgments have been rendered in violation of the Constitution and Laws of the United States.

The Bivens, Ziglar and Hernandez cases are vivid examples

1.4 1.5

 of how Judges and Justices of the Federal Government of the United States, have engaged in the activity of creating implied, unwritten, self-executing, extraconstitutional powers by Judicial Decree, in complete violation of Article I, Section 8, Clauses 17 and 18 as well as the Tenth Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5.

In the <u>Bivens</u> case and its progeny cited hereinabove, the Supreme Court has acted, by and through Judicial Decree, to usurp the Legislative Power of the Congress of the United States, in order to nullify the provisions of the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, §1986, the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, as well as the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, in a clear attempt to protect Federal Officers, Agents, and Employees, who, while acting in their individual and private capacity(ies), disguised under color of Federal Law, having conspired to enter the several states of the Union in order to deprive the inhabitants therein of inherent rights protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States from civil liability; thereby depriving those who have been damaged from the right to redress, as protected by the First Amendment.

Those who rely on <u>Bivens</u> and its progeny, including <u>Ziglar</u> and <u>Hernandez</u>, in order to claim immunity from civil liability for conspiracy under color of Federal Law to violate the protected rights of the inhabitants of the several states of the Union as well as the District of

24

25

26

27

28

Columbia, the Federal Territories, the Federal Possessions, the Federal Commonwealths and Federal Enclaves of the Federal Government identified by Congress as [Federal] "States," do so at their own peril, as the provisions of the Acts of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986 in fact categorically and unquestionably apply to individuals, who, while they may actually be employed by the Federal Government, have acted in their individual and private capacity(ies) unequivocally because they have acted in disguise under color of Federal Law, and in doing so have conspired to violate the rights of the inhabitants of the several states of the Union, by entering the several states of the Union under force of arms, outside of any Federal Enclave, in order to subject the inhabitants to injury, oppression, threats and intimidation, under the pretense [color] of Federal Law, thereby converting the claim, exercise, and enjoyment of inherent rights protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States into the appearance of a Federal Criminal Activity; subjecting the inhabitants to malicious Federal Criminal Prosecution without either authority or jurisdiction; and subjecting the inhabitants to unlawful imprisonment.

Such persons, who conspire under color of Federal Law, to violate the rights of the inhabitants of the several states of the Union, are liable to the party injured for damages and equitable relief in Federal Court pursuant

to the Acts of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986; as well as 28 U.S.C. §1331, §1332, and §1343.

# DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 12]:

It is therefore Declared that the provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, and 42 U.S.C. §1986, enforcing the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, prohibit the Federal Government of the United States and the governments of the several states of the Union, from making or enforcing any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States and/or any other person(s) within the Territorial Jurisdiction of the United States; thereby subjecting Officers, Agents and Employees of the Federal Government, who, while acting in their individual and private capacity(ies), causes or subjects any party within the Territorial Jurisdiction of the United States or elsewhere, to be subjected to conspiracy under color of Federal Law, in order to violate any of said party's rights, which are protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, as to liability to the party so damaged, to a suit for money damages [Tort]; and other relief.

//

25 //

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

26 //

28

27

QUESTION 13:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Do the provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §2000dd, establish that it is a violation of rights protected by the Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, to subject any individual who is in the custody or physical control of the United States Government, regardless of nationality or physical location, to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment of punishments, subjecting the individuals who have been violated to a cause of action for liability for money damages and other relief under the provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, 42 U.S.C. §1986, 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1332, and 28 U.S.C. §1343, against those Agents, Officers, and Employees of the Federal Government, who engage in the practice of subjecting individuals in the custody or the physical control of the Federal Government of the United States to violation(s) of rights protected by the Fifth Amendment, the Eighth Amendment, and the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, by subjecting such individuals to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment?

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 13:

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, as evidenced by the Act of Congress at 42 U.S.C. §2000dd, established that

27

28

regardless of how or why an individual is in the custody of or under the physical control of the United States Government, including but not limited to being subjected to unlawful imprisonment under color of a VOID JUDGMENT in a Criminal Case rendered by a United States District Court Judge in violation of the Constitution of the United States; and/or rendered without jurisdiction over the subject matter; which includes but is not limited to rendering a "Judgment in a Criminal Case" without proof on the record that all locations relevant to a criminal case are within a Federal Enclave located in the state where the United States District Court is located; and/or a Judgment rendered in violation of Due Process of Law; that it is a violation of said party's rights not to be subjected to cruel, inhuman, degrading treatment or punishment, protected by the Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

The provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §2000dd, establishing that regardless of the nationality of the individual in the custody or under the physical control of the United States Government; it is a violation of the Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment; specifically and particularly to violate the requirement of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, that no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its

jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws," making it a violation of protected rights to deny anyone, regardless of nationality, who is within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the United States, the equal protection of the law.

42 U.S.C. §2000dd further established that the statutory meaning of "within its jurisdiction" [within the scope of that specific statute §2000dd], is not limited to only the District of Columbia, the Territories, Possessions, Commonwealths or Enclaves of the Federal Government, but includes any physical location anywhere in the world, including but not limited to physical locations in any of the several states of the Union, where an individual is in the custody or under the physical control of individuals who are acting under color of the authority of the Federal Government of the United States.

The provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §2000dd(d) clearly prevents any Officer, Agent, or Employee of the Federal Government who subjects any individual in their custody or physical control when they are acting under color of the authority of the Federal Government of the United States to "cruel, unusual, and inhumane treatment or punishment" as a violation of rights "prohibited by the Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States..."

27 28

42 U.S.C. §2000dd has unequivocally established a cause of action for the recovery of damages for violation(s) of any right(s) protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, of the individual injured by the cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment endured or suffered, pursuant to the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986.

While acting under color of their authority of the Federal Government of the United States; Officers, Agents, and Employees who subject individuals in their custody or physical control to cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment are liable and subject to lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and/or §1986, when the cause of action under 42 U.S.C. §2000dd for the recovery of damages includes but is not limited to the following:

- Unlawful imprisonment and/or confinement under (a) color of "VOID JUDGMENTS," identified by the Act of Congress evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §1201, Kidnapping;
- While housed in Federal Prison Facilities either owned or controlled by the United States Department of Justice by and through the Federal Bureau of Prisons; subjecting individuals to:
- Willful exposure to deadly contaminants, including but not limited to: (1) Toxic Black Mold; (2) Staphylococcus Aureus; (3) Senotrophomonas Maltophilia;

- (4) H-Pylori; (4) AIDS; (5) MRSA; (6) Hepatitis-C, and other contaminants, knowing that such exposure results in permanent medical-related injury, including but not limited to: (1) Respiratory Symptoms; (2) Circulatory Symptoms; (3) Mental and Neurological Symptoms; (4) Vision and Eye Problems; (5) Skin Problems; (6) Immune System Problems; (7) Reproductive System Problems; (8) Chronic Fatigue, Tiredness and Discomfort; and (9) Other Illnesses and Health Effect; including (10) Death;
- (ii) Willful denial of appropriate medical staff at Federal Prison Facilities, and the denial of minimal, adequate medical care;
- (iii) Physical and emotional abuse by Correctional Officers and Staff operating Federal Prison Facilities; specifically and particularly directed at disabled individuals, including those in wheelchairs, those requiring walkers, and those requiring canes; as well as those with artificial limbs;
- (iv) Segregated confinement; and while housed in Administrative Detention or Disciplinary Segregation known as the "Special Housing Unit," being subjected to abusive, inhumane, insect-infested and unsanitary conditions;
- (v) Retaliation for claiming and exercising the protected right to Petition for Redress, using Agency Administrative Remedy Procedures or otherwise, in violation

Prohibition of Retaliation, which states: "No person reporting

of the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1997d,

conditions which may constitute a violation of this Act

shall be subjected to retaliation in any manner for so

 reporting." Acts of retaliation include but are not limited to: (1) Physical Assault; (2) Solitary Confinement; (3)
Being subjected to constant transfer from one facility to another, [commonly referred to as "diesel therapy"]; (4) restriction of communications with family, friends, and/or legal counsel; (5) interfering with access to the Court(s) in order to petition for redress, and other retaliatory act(s) against the Complainant/Plaintiff/ Petitioner; and:

(vi) Those acts identified in the United States Reservations, Declarations, and Understandings to the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Forms of Cruel, Inhumane, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment of December 10, 1984 [See: 42 U.S.C. §2000dd(d)].

That all rights protected under the Fifth Amendment, the Eighth Amendment, and the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States that have been violated against individuals under 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and/or §1986.

11.

//

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 13]:

It is therefore Declared that the provisions of the Act evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §2000dd, establish that it is a right not to be subjected to cruel, inhumane, and degrading treatment or punishment, and that this right is protected by the Fifth Amendment, the Eighth Amendment, and the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, not to subject any individual in the custody or physical control of the United States Government, regardless of nationality or physical location, to cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment; thereby subjecting those Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government of the United States who engage in the practice of subjecting individuals in the custody or physical control of the Government of the United States to a lawsuit for violation of rights under the Fifth Amendment, the Eighth Amendment, and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, for having subjected any such individuals to cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment; for liability under the provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, and/or 42 U.S.C. §1986; and under 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1332, and 28 U.S.C. §1343.

//

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

//

11

QUESTION 14:

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Do the provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1986, establish that any person, who, having knowledge that the wrongs conspired to be done, and mentioned in the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1985 are about to be committed; including but not limited to the act(s) of two or more persons, who disguise themselves with Federal Law and Office, and thereby conspire to enter any of the several states of the Union outside Federal Enclaves, for the purpose of depriving any person or class of persons of any right protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, either directly or indirectly; and having the power to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of said act(s) of conspiracy under color of law, nevertheless neglects or refuses to take action in order to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of the act(s) of depriving a person or persons of any right protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, is personally liable in his or her individual and private capacity for money damages and other relief to the party injured?

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 14:

As required by the provisions of the Constitution at Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; and the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, Congress, by and through legislation

25

26

27

28

as evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1986, established further enforcement of the Fourteenth Amendment's protection of all rights enacted by the Constitution of the United States, by making those who, while having knowledge of two or more. persons who have disguised themselves with and under the color [pretense] of Federal Law and Office, and have entered any one or more of the several states of the Union under force of arms, outside any Federal Enclave, conspiring under color of Federal Law to subject the inhabitants of the several states of the Union to the application and enforcement of Federal Law; and actually subjects any inhabitant of any one or more of the several states of the Union to violation under color of Federal Law of any right protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, is thereby liable for the damages caused to the injured party by those who have conspired under color of Federal Law to violate the injured party's [or parties'] rights.

The provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1986, Action For Neglect To Prevent Conspiracy, provides:

"Every person who, having knowledge that any of the wrongs conspired to be done, and mentioned in the preceding section [42 U.S.C. §1985], are about to be committed, and having power to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of the same, neglects or refused to do so, if such wrongful

28

act be committed, shall be liable to the party injured, or his legal representatives, for all damages caused by such wrongful act, which such person by reasonable diligence could have prevented; and such damages may be recovered in an action on the case; and any number of persons guilty of such wrongful neglect or refusal may be joined as defendants in the action, and if the death of any party be caused by any such wrongful act and neglect, the legal representatives of the deceased shall have such action therefor, and may recover not exceeding five thousand dollars damages therein, for the benefit of the widow of the deceased, if there be one, and if there be no widow, then for the benefit of the next of kin of the deceased. But no action under the provisions of this section shall be sustained which is not commenced within one year after the cause of action has accrued."

Individuals who, while acting in an official capacity which would include but not be limited to Federal District Court Judges, Circuit Court Judges, and the United States Attorney General, who would have had knowledge of two or more persons who have disguised themselves with and under color of Federal Law and Office, such as the Office of the United States Attorney; and entered any one or more of the several states of the Union, under force of arms, outside any Federal Enclave, thereby conspiring under color of Federal Law, to subject the inhabitants of the several

states of the Union to the deprivation of rights protected by the Constitution of the United States of said inhabitants, including, but not limited to, depriving an inhabitant of a state of the Union of liberty, property, and life.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Those who hold the position as United States District Court Judge of a District Court located in any one of the several states of the Union; and the position of the Office of the United States Attorney General, who have, by oath or affirmation, agreed to uphold the Supreme Law of the Land, are presumed to know the law, and would therefore have knowledge when two or more persons disguise themselves with and under color of Federal Law and the Office of the United States Attorney, who have entered any sovereign state of the Union, under force of arms, outside any Federal Enclave, and have conspired under color of Federal Law to subject the inhabitants of the several states of the Union to the deprivation of rights protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, including but not limited to depriving inhabitants of liberty, property and life; and while in the Official Capacity as United States District Court Judge and/or United States Attorney General, have or have had the lawful authority to prevent the deprivation of rights under color of law by those who have disguised themselves under color of Federal Law and Office, by refusing, as Attorney General, to allow a Federal Criminal Case to be filed; and by the United States District

Court Judge refusing to accept jurisdiction of any criminal case, when there is no evidence that all locations relevant to the Federal Criminal Case are within Federal Enclaves.

Should those who hold Office as a United States District Judge of a District Court located in one of the several states of the Union, or the Office of the United States Attorney General, neglects or fails to prevent or aid in preventing those who disguise themselves under color of Federal Law from entering any sovereign state of the Union under force of arms, and said persons in fact enter a sovereign state of the Union outside any Federal Enclave, and subjecting any inhabitant of the state to injury, oppression, threats, intimidation, malicious criminal prosecution, and unlawful imprisonment, under color of Federal Law without any lawful jurisdiction, pursuant to the Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1986; said United States District Court Judge and/or United States Attorney General, then deemed persons, who are acting in his/her/their private capacity(ies), and are subject to the injured inhabitant of the sovereign state for all damages caused by those persons who disguised themselves under color of Federal Law and who entered the sovereign state of the Union under force of arms outside Federal Enclaves, and violated the inhabitant of rights protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States.

The damages caused those state inhabitants being

-103-

3

2

5 6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28 subjected to unlawful imprisonment, incurring ongoing injury, results in a renewal of the one year limitations period established by the Act evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1986, for each day that the state inhabitant is continued to be subjected to unlawful imprisonment.

Every inhabitant of any of the several states of the Union, who has and/or continues to suffer damages in the nature of unlawful imprisonment, as a proximate or direct result of the neglect or refusal of those who hold Office as United States District Court Judge and/or United States Attorney General, preventing or aiding in preventing those disguising themselves under color of law from entering the sovereign states of the Union, under force of arms; thereby subjecting the inhabitant(s) to injury, oppression, threats, intimidation, malicious prosecution; are also entitled to relief under the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986.

#### DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 14]:

It is therefore Declared that the provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Act, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1986, established that any person, including but not limited to United States District Court Judges of a District Court located in a sovereign state of the Union; and the United States Attorney General, who, having knowledge that the wrongs conspired to be done, and mentioned in the Act of

Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1985 are about to be committed; including but not limited to the act(s) of two or more persons who disguise themselves with Federal Law and Office, and thereby conspire to enter any of the several states of the Union outside Federal Enclaves, for the purpose of depriving any person or class of persons of any right protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, either directly or indirectly; and while having the power to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of said act(s) of conspiracy under color of law; and nevertheless neglects or refuses to take action in order to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of those act(s) which deprive a person or persons of any rights protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, is personally liable in his or her individual and private capacity for money damages and other relief to the party injured.

#### QUESTION 15:

Is a Tort Action for recovery of damages and other relief under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, subject to <u>any</u> statute of limitations for commencement of such an action in a court of the United States?

//

//

27

28

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 15:

The several states of the Union in Congress, by the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2401(a), <u>Time For Commencing Action Against the United States</u>, provides that: "... every civil action commenced against the United States [Federal Government] shall be barred unless the complaint is filed within six years after the right of action first accrues ..." (emphasis added).

28 U.S.C. §2401(b) provides: "a [A] tort claim against the United States shall be forever barred unless it is presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within two years after such claim accrues or unless action is begun within six months after the date of mailing, by certified or registered mail, of notice of final denial of the claim by the agency to which it was presented."

The Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2679 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, entitled: Exclusiveness of Remedy, holds that no civil action for the recovery of Tort Damages can be filed against an Officer or Employee, who, while acting in his or her official capacity within the scope of said Officer or Employee's Office or Employment, for a violation of the Constitution of the United States, or a violation of a statute of the United States under which such action against an individual is otherwise authorized.

-106-

The Federal Government of the United States, being established by the Constitution, has no authority to authorize the violation of any provision of the Constitution or statute of the United States. It is therefore not legally possible for any Officer or Employee of the Federal Government of the United States, in his or her Official Capacity, while acting within the scope of said Officer's or Employee's Office or Employment, to violate the provisions of the Constitution or the statutes of the United States; or to violate the protected rights of any individual in any of the several states of the Union, or within the Territorial Jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the United States.

Therefore, a Tort Action under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, as evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, can only be brought against a person in his or her individual and private capacity for the recovery of damages, and for other remedy and relief, for conspiracy under color of [Federal] Law, to violate any right protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, of the party so injured. Such action arises under the Constitution, Laws, and Treaties of the United States.

The Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1658(a),

Time Limitations on the Commencement of Civil Actions Arising

Under Acts of Congress, established that: "Except as otherwise provided by law, a civil action arising under an Act of Congress enacted after the date of the enactment of this

section [enacted December 1, 1990], may not be commenced later than 4 years after the cause of action accrues."

A civil action arising under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, enacted prior to December 1, 1990, <u>is not subject</u> to the limitations to commencement of such an action in a United States District Court.

A United States District Court would have jurisdiction of such a civil action under the Acts of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §1331, Federal Question; and/or 28 U.S.C. §1332, Diversity of Citizenship; and 28 U.S.C. §1343, Civil Rights and Elective Franchise.

Therefore, there is no Federal Statute of Limitations with regard to a Civil Tort Action filed in a United States District Court under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, against persons sued in their individual and private capacity(ies).

### DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 15]:

It is therefore Declared that there is no Federal Statute of Limitations with regard to a Civil Tort Action filed in a court of the United States, under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 42 U.S.C. §1985, and 42 U.S.C. §1986, against persons sued in his/her/their individual and private capacity(ies).

//

//

QUESTION 16:

Is there any requirement of law to exhaust Federal Agency Administrative Procedures prior to commencing a Civil Tort Action under the Civil Rights Act of 1871 for the recovery of damages and other relief against persons sued in his/her/their individual and private capacity(ies)?

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 16:

The several states of the Union in Congress, by and through the Federal Tort Claims Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2675, Disposition By Federal Agency As Prerequisite; Evidence; provided that prior to a Civil Tort Action being filed under the Federal Tort Claims Act against an Officer or Employee of the Federal Government being sued in his or her Official Capacity, §2675 provides:

"(a) An action shall not be instituted upon a claim against the United States for money damages for injury or loss or property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, unless the claimant shall have first presented the claim to the appropriate Federal agency and his claim shall have finally been denied by the agency in writing and sent by certified or registered mail. The failure of an agency to make final disposition of a claim within six months after it is filed, at the option of the

-109-

1.3

. 

claimant any time thereafter, be deemed a final denial of the claim for purposes of this section ..."

The provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2671, et. seq., <u>Definitions</u>, specifically 28 U.S.C. §2675, <u>Disposition By Federal Agency As Prerequisite</u>, <u>Evidence</u>, only require the exhaustion of agency Administrative Remedies prior to filing a Civil Tort Claim if the United States is to be sued; and/or any Officer, Agent or Employee of the Federal Government being sued in his or her Official Capacity for the recovery of Tort Money Damages.

The Act of Congress evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1997e,

<u>Suits By Prisoners</u>, provides in Section (a) that: "No
action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions
under Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United

States (42 U.S.C. §1983), or any other Federal law, by
a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional
facility until such administrative remedies as are available
are exhausted."

An action brought with respect to prison conditions would be an action for equitable relief only against Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government sued in his or her or their Official Capacity, in order to correct prison conditions complained of. While the provisions of the Act evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983 provides that an action may be filed for exclusive equitable relief, the

only Government Officer who could be used in his Official
Capacity under the provisions of the Act evidenced at 42
U.S.C. §1983 is a Judicial Officer, for an act or an omission taken in such Officer's Judicial Capacity for injunctive relief only. The Act provides: "... except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable ..."

Officers, Agents, and Employees of either the Federal Government or government of any of the several states of the Union in their Official Capacity, are persons with regard to the Act evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983; as such Officers, Agents, or Employees, while acting within the scope of their Office or Employment, do not have the capacity to violate any right, privilege, or immunity of any injured party protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States under color of law, as there can be no law authorizing any Officer, Agent, or Employee of either the Federal Government or state government to violate the Supreme Law of the Land.

There is no law requiring the exhaustion of any government agency's Administrative Remedy Procedures, when a person, as a person, as a private party, is sued in his or her individual and private capacity under the Act evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, for the recovery of money

damages and other equitable relief by the injured party for damage(s) suffered for violation(s) of any right(s) protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States under color [pretense] of Federal Law; since private parties are persons within the meaning of the Act evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, and such private person(s) does/do not come under the jurisdiction of any government agency.

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 16]:

It is therefore Declared that there is no legal requirement to exhaust Federal Agency Administrative Remedy Procedures prior to the commencement of a Civil Tort Action under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, for the recovery of money damages and other relief, against persons sued in his/her/their individual and private capacity(ies).

#### QUESTION 17:

Is any person sued under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, in his or her individual and private capacity for the recovery of money damages and other equitable relief, entitled to Official or Sovereign Immunity to civil suit as a defense in a Federal Court of the United States?

//

//

-112-

BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 17:

The Constitution of the United States vests specific and limited powers to the Federal Government of the United States; and to the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative Departments of the Federal Government of the United States, and to the Officers, Agents, and Employees, which all remain dormant unless and until the several states of the Union in Congress carry into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the Federal Government of the United States, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

The powers vested by the Constitution in the Federal Government of the United States, its Executive Department, Judicial Department, and Legislative Department, and/or Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government, do not include the power to violate any element of the Supreme Law of the Land, identified with specificity at Article VI, Clause 2 of the Constitution; which includes the Constitution, all Laws made in pursuance to the Constitution, and the Treaties made under the authority of the United States; and as such it is not <u>legally possible</u> for the Federal Government, its Departments, or its Officers, Agents and Employees, while acting in their Official Capacity within the scope of said Office or Employment with the Federal Government of the United States, to violate any right protected by the Constitution of the United States. It is because of this specific limit of Constitutional

-113-

2

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23<sub>2</sub>

25

26 27

28

power that creates the concept of so-called "sovereign or official immunity," which in reality are the limits imposed on the Federal Government, as well as its Departments, Agencies, Officers and Employees.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1871 evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, clearly omit any action for the recovery of money damages against the Federal Government, its Departments, Agencies, or Officers acting in their Official Capacity within the scope of their Office or Employment, by limiting action for the recovery of money damages against persons sued in his/her/their individual and private capacity(ies) for the private act of violation of any right of the injured party protected by the Constitution of the United States, as the Government, its Departments, Agencies, and Officers acting in their respective Official Capacity(ies), could not be persons within the context of the Civil Rights Act of 1871, as evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983; as there is no legal capacity for the Government or its Officers to violate anyone's rights protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States.

Therefore, no <u>person</u> sued in his or her individual and private capacity for the recovery of money damages and other equitable relief, is entitled to <u>any form of Official or Sovereign Immunity</u> as a defense in a Federal Court of the United States under the Civil Rights Act of

. 

. 

1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986.

# DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 17]:

It is therefore Declared that any person sued under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, in his or her individual and private capacity for the recovery of money damages and other equitable relief, is not entitled to qualified Official or Sovereign Immunity to civil suit(s) as a defense in a Federal Court of the United States.

### QUESTION 18:

Can a Judge of a court created by an Act of Congress, who holds office as a Judge of the United States during good behavior, continue to hold office as a Judge of the United States if a Civil or Criminal Judgment has been rendered against such Judge, in his or her individual or private capacity?

# BASIS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED FOR QUESTION 18:

Article III, Section 1 of the Constitution establishes that "The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behavior..."

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, carried into execution the power vested in Congress by Article III, Section 1,

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

23

22

24 25

27

26 28

to ordain and establish inferior courts to the Supreme Court, establishing by and through express legislation, that the Judges of such inferior courts established under the authority of Article III, Section 1, would hold Office as a Judge during good behavior, as evidenced at:

- 28 U.S.C. §44(b): "Circuit judges shall hold office during good behavior";
- 28 U.S.C. §134(a): "The district judges shall hold office during good behavior"; and:
- 28 U.S.C. §252: "Judges of the Court of International Trade shall hold office during good behavior..."

Federal Judges who hold office during good behavior, like all Officers of the Federal Government, pursuant to Article VI, Clause 3, are required to be bound by oath or affirmation, to support the Constitution as the Supreme Law of the Land. The several states of the Union in Congress as evidenced at 5 U.S.C. §1331, Oath of Office; and 28 U.S.C. §453, Oaths of Justices and Judges, prescribed the specific requirement for the oath required of Federal Judges, both as Officers and Judges of the Federal Government of the United States.

Since all Federal Judges who hold office during good behavior are acting under oath or affirmation to not only be bound to the Supreme Law of the Land, but to affirm

allegiance to the Supreme Law of the Land; and thus by extension to the People, the sovereign body politic; said Federal Judges are presumed to know the Law.

For Federal Judges to be holding their office during good behavior means that the Federal Judges act only according to the Constitution of the United States; act only when the Judge has evidence of jurisdiction on the record of the Court regarding any case before the Federal Judge; and act to prevent the violation of Due Process of Law regarding litigants; as well as to avoid any act that would violate any right protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States of any party appearing before the Federal Judge.

Federal Judges who do in fact hold their office during good behavior while acting within the scope of the Office and Employment as indicated above, are not subject to any civil or criminal action in their Official Capacity as a Federal Judge, since the Federal Judge is in compliance with the limits imposed by the Constitution of the United States.

However, when a question arises as to whether a Federal Judge is, or is not acting in good behavior due to violations of the Constitution; to acting without jurisdiction; to violating the Due Process Rights of litigants appearing before the Federal Judge, or is engaged in conduct which

1.8

 violates any right protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States of a party before the Judge, the party so affected by such conduct by a Federal Judge <a href="https://example.com/has-redress">has redress</a>, including but not limited to the following:

- 1. The injured party could file an action under the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1343 and 28 U.S.C. §1651 against the Federal Judge in question in his or her Official Capacity seeking first: a Declaratory Judgment pursuant to the act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2201, in order to declare the rights and other legal relations; and to secure a Judgment that settles the questions of uncertainty, which would include, but is not limited to:
- (a) Whether or not Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government, including Executive and Judicial Officers, have lawful authority to enter any of the several states of the Union, under force or arms, outside Federal Enclaves, to subject the inhabitants to the application and enforcement of Federal Law, Rules, Regulations, Ordinances, or Federal Court Judgments; and:
- (b) Whether or not a Federal Judge has the lawful Constitutional and Statutory Authority to accept jurisdiction of a Federal Criminal Case when no evidence exists in the record of the Court that all locations relevant to such a Federal Criminal Case are all located in Federal Enclaves.

27

28

A Declaratory Judgment establishing that such conduct violates the Constitution, is without jurisdiction/authority, and a violation of Due Process of Law, resulting in depriving a party of liberty, property, or even life, under color of law, would entitle a party who took action against a Federal Judge in his or her Official Capacity under the provisions of the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1332, and 28 U.S.C. §1343, to seek injunctive relief in order to prevent ongoing, continuous injury and damage under the color or pretense of Federal Law being applied and enforced within a state of the Union.

Since the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1871 2. evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983 and §1985 establish that a suit filed by an injured party against a Federal Judge in the Federal Judge's individual and private capacity for the recovery of money damages and/or equitable remedy and relief; including but not limited to remedy in the nature of a Declaratory Judgment, is not subject to the statute of limitations; is not subject to the exhaustion of Agency Administrative Remedies prior to commencing such a suit; and that Official and/or Sovereign Immunity to civil liability is not a defense when a person, albeit a Judge, is sued in his or her individual and private capacity under the provisions of the Acts evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, and §1985; as well as 28 U.S.C. §1331, §1332 and §1343.

The injured party is free at any time to file a civil action for the recovery of money damages and equitable remedy(ies), including but not limited to Declaratory Judgment, Injunctive Remedy, and Mandamus Remedy, against any person, while acting under color of Federal Law, even as a Federal Judge, violates any right(s) of the injured party protected by the Constitution of the United States in a court of the United States of competent jurisdiction.

- at 18 U.S.C. §4, Misprision of Felony, the party so injured by any person, who, while acting under the color or pretense of Federal Law, even as a Federal Judge, who willfully violated any right of the injured party that is protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States that is identified by the Act of Congress evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §242, as the Act of Criminal Misconduct of Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law, said injured person has both the right protected by the First Amendment, i.e.: presenting a Petition for Redress; and a duty established under 18 U.S.C. §4, to present a Report of Criminal Misconduct as the injured party, who:
- "... having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title

or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

Although the injured party cannot personally prosecute a Criminal Complaint, the injured party can forward such a Report of Criminal Misconduct to the United States Attorney General, a Federal Judicial Officer, a member of the United States Military, and so forth. It would then be up to the prosecuting authority to begin a Formal Criminal Action against any person, who, while acting under color of Federal Law, even as a Federal Judge, who willfully violates any right of the injured party.

4. Any party so injured by a person, who while acting under color of Federal Law, even as a Federal Judge, who willfully violated any right of the injured party that is protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States, can present a Complaint to the Chief Judge of the Circuit under 28 U.S.C. §351, Complaints; Judge Defined; since a Federal Judge willfully acting in violation of the Constitution; acting without jurisdiction; and/or violating Due Process of Law; would be engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the Court, monumentally far from "good behavior."

The Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §351, et. seq. provides in pertinent part:

(a) Filing of Complaint by any Person: Any person alleging that a judge has engaged in conduct prejudicial

27

28

2

3

4

to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts, or alleging that such judge is unable to discharge all the duties of office by reason of mental or physical disability, may file with the clerk of the court of appeals for the circuit a written complaint containing a brief statement of the facts constituting such conduct.

#### (b) ...

- Transmittal of Complaint: Upon receipt of a complaint filed under subsection (a), the clerk shall promptly transmit the complaint to the chief judge of the circuit, or, if the conduct complained of is that of the chief judge, to that circuit judge in regular active service next senior in date of commission. ... The clerk shall simultaneously transmit a copy of the complaint to the judge whose conduct is the subject of the complaint. The clerk shall also transmit a copy of any complaint identified under subsection (b) to the judge whose conduct is the subject of the complaint.
- (d) Definitions: In this chapter [28 U.S.C. §§351 et. seq.] --
- (1) the term "judge" means a circuit judge, district judge, bankruptcy judge, or magistrate judge; and:
- the term "complainant" means the person filing (2) a complaint under subsection (a) of this section.

9

11

13

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22

24

25 26

27 28

23

Once such a Complaint is filed, pursuant to the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §352, Review of Complaint by Chief Judge, the Complaint is reviewed by the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court.

Under the provisions of the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §352, the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §352(a), is to review a Complainant's Written Complaint, and may either (b) Dismiss the Complaint by Written Order, stating his or her reasons pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §352(b)(1); or, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §352(b)(2), "conclude the proceeding if the chief judge finds that appropriate corrective action has been taken[,] or that action on the complaint is no longer necessary because of intervening events."

"The chief judge shall transmit copies of the written order [of dismissal] to the complainant and to the judge whose conduct is the subject of the complaint."

The provisions of 28 U.S.C. §352(c) provide that: "A complainant or judge aggrieved by a final order of the chief judge under this section may petition the judicial council of the circuit for review thereof. The denial of a petition for review of the chief judge's order shall be final and conclusive and shall not be judicially reviewable on appeal or otherwise."

The provisions of 28 U.S.C. §352(d) provide that:

"Each judicial council may, pursuant to rules prescribed under section 358 [28 U.S.C. §358], refer a petition for review filed under subsection (c) to a panel of no fewer than 5 members of the council, at least 2 of whom shall be district judges.

Under the provisions of the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §354(a)(2), if a Complainant's Complaint is not dismissed, a Judge could be subject to 28 U.S.C. §354(a)(2)(A): "In general. Action by the judicial council under paragraph (1)(C) may include --

- (i) ordering that, on a temporary basis for a time certain, no further cases be assigned to the judge whose conduct is the subject of a complaint;
- (ii) censuring or reprimanding such judge by means of private communication; and:
- (iii) censuring or reprimanding such judge by means of public announcement."

Furthermore, when a Complaint is filed against an Article III Judge, 28 U.S.C. §354(a)(2)(B) states:

"For Article III judges. If the conduct of a judge appointed to hold office during good behavior is the subject of the complaint, action by the judicial council under paragraph (1)(C) may include --

- (i) certifying disability of the judge pursuant to the procedures and standards provided under section 372(b) [28 U.S.C. §372(b)]; and:
- (ii) requesting that the judge voluntarily retire, with the provision that the length of service requirements under section 371 of this title [28 U.S.C. §371] shall not apply."

The provisions of 28 U.S.C. §354(a)(3) provide that the judicial council has no lawful authority to remove an Article III Judge, to wit:

28 U.S.C. §354(a)(3)(A): "Article III judges. Under no circumstances may the judicial council order removal from office of any judge appointed to hold office during good behavior."

The provisions of 28 U.S.C. §354(b) provides for the referral of a Complaint to the Judicial Conference. 28 U.S.C. §354(b)(1) provides:

- (1) "In general. In addition to the authority granted under subsection (a), the judicial council may, in its discretion, refer any complaint under section 351 [28 U.S.C. §351], together with the record of any associated proceedings and its recommendations for appropriate action, to the Judicial Conference of the United States."
  - (2) Special Circumstances, provides:

"In any case in which the judicial council determines, on the basis of a complaint and an investigation under this chapter, or on the basis of information otherwise available to the judicial council, that a judge appointed to hold office during good behavior may have engaged in conduct --

- (A) which might constitute one or more grounds for impeachment under Article II of the Constitution, or:
- (B) which, in the interest of justice, is not amenable to resolution by the judicial council, the judicial council shall promptly certify such determination, together with any complaint and a record of any associated proceedings, to the Judicial Conference of the United States."

# 28 U.S.C. §354(b)(3) provides:

"Notice to complainant and judge. A judicial council acting under authority of this subsection shall, unless contrary to the interests of justice, immediately submit written notice to the complainant and to the judge whose conduct is the subject of the action taken under this subsection."

The provisions of the Act evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §355, Action by Judicial Conference, provides:

"(a) In general. Upon referral or certification of any matter under section 354(b) [28 U.S.C. §354(b)], the Judicial Conference, after consideration of the prior

proceedings and such additional investigation as it considers appropriate, shall by majority vote take such action, as described in section 354(a)(1)(C) and (2) [28 U.S.C. §354(a)(1)(C) and (2)], as it considers appropriate."

# 28 U.S.C. §355(b), If Impeachment Warranted, provides:

- "(1) In general. If the Judicial Conference concurs in the determination of the judicial council, or makes its own determination, that consideration of impeachment may be warranted, it shall so certify and transmit the determination and the record of proceedings to the House of Representatives for whatever action the House of Representatives considers to be necessary. Upon receipt of the determination and record of proceedings in the House of Representatives, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make available to the public the determination and any reasons for the determination.
- (2) In case of felony conviction. If a judge has been convicted of a felony under State or Federal law and has exhausted all means of obtaining direct review of the conviction, or the time for seeking further direct review of the conviction has passed and no such review has been sought, the Judicial Conference may, by majority vote and without referral or certification under section 354(b) [28 U.S.C. §354(b)], transmit to the House of Representatives a determination that consideration of impeachment may be

. 

warranted, together with appropriate court records, for whatever action the House of Representatives considers to be necessary."

The Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §358, Rules, mandates that: "Each judicial council and the Judicial Conference may prescribe such rules of the conduct of proceedings under this chapter [28 U.S.C. §§351, et. seq.], including the processing of petitions for review, as each considers to be appropriate."

Additionally, the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §363, mandates that "The United States Court of Federal Claims, the Court of International Trade, and the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall each prescribe rules, consistent with the provisions of this chapter [28 U.S.C. §§351, et. seq.], establishing procedures for the filing of complaints with respect to the conduct of any judge of such court and for the investigation and resolution of such complaints. In investigating and taking action with respect to any such complaint, each such court shall have the power granted to a judicial council under this chapter [28 U.S.C. §§351, et. seq.].

The Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §362,

Other Provisions and Rules Not Affected, provides:

"Except as expressly provided in this chapter [28 U.S.C. §§351, et. seq.], nothing in this chapter [28 U.S.C.

§§351, et. seq.,] shall be construed to affect any other provision of this title, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, or the Federal Rules of Evidence."

Pursuant to the Rules For Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, Rule 24, Public Availability of Decisions, provides that all prior complaints filed against a Federal Judge are available to the public, and most specifically, the Complainant, to wit:

- "(a) General Rule; Specific Cases: When final action has been taken on a complaint and is no longer subject to review, all orders entered by the chief judge and judicial council, including memoranda incorporated by reference in those orders and any dissenting opinions by separate statements by members of the judicial council, but excluding any orders under Rule 5 or 11(f), must be made public ..." with the exceptions as noted at Rule 24(a)(1)(2)(3)(4) and (5).
- "(b) Manner of Making Public: The orders described in (a) must be made public by placing them in a publicly accessible file in the office of the circuit clerk and by placing the orders on the court's public website. If the orders appear to have precedential value, the chief judge may cause them to be published. In addition, the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability will make

available on the Judiciary's website, <a href="www.uscourts.gov">www.uscourts.gov</a>, selected illsutrative orders described in paragraph (a), appropriately redacted, to provide additional information to the public on how complaints are addressed under the Act."

#### In summary:

Any Federal Judge who engages in civil and/or criminal misconduct of acting in violation of Due Process of Law which results in the violation of any right protected by the Constitution and Laws of the United States:

- (a) is liable to the party so damaged, under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, in said Federal Judge's individual and private capacity, for money damages and other equitable remedy and relief; and that said Judge sued in his or her individual and private capacity is not entitled to any form of qualified immunity;
- (b) is liable to the Government of the United States, acting on behalf of the damaged party, under the Criminal Laws of the Federal Government, including but not limited to the Acts evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §4, 18 U.S.C. §241, and 18 U.S.C. §242, in said Federal Judge's individual and private capacity;
  - (c) is liable under the provisions of the Judicial

28

Conduct and Disability Act, evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §351, et. seq., upon the filing of a Complaint of a damaged party/Complainant, which include, but is not limited to:

- (i) An Order, for a limited time certain, that no further cases be assigned to the [Federal] Judge whose conduct is the subject of a Complaint;
- (ii) Censuring or reprimanding such [Federal]Judge by means of private communication;
- (iii) Censuring or reprimanding such [Federal] Judge by means of public announcement;
- (iv) Certifying disability of the Judge pursuant to the procedures and standards under 28 U.S.C. §372(b);
- (v) Requesting that the Judge voluntarily retire, with the provision that the length of service requirements under 28 U.S.C. §371 shall not apply; and:
- $% \left( v_{1}\right)$  Referral to the House of Representatives for impeachment.

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 18]:

It is therefore Declared that a Judge of a Court created by an Act of Congress, who holds office as a Judge of the United States during good behavior, against whom a Complaint has been filed with a Court of the United States for recovery of damages under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced

at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986, or against whom a Report of Criminal Misconduct has been filed; resulting in a Criminal Action in a Court of the United States; or against whom a Complaint is filed under the provisions of the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act, evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §351, et. seq., for acting in violation of the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, acting without jurisdiction, or acting in violation of Due Process of Law, is subject to civil liability for damages; is subject to criminal liability; and is subject to censure, reprimand, retirement, or impeachment; and removal from office.

## QUESTION 19:

Are Officers, Agents, and Employees of the Federal Government of the United States, who, after agreeing by oath or affirmation to uphold the Supreme Law of the Land, to secure an office of trust, honor and/or profit with the Federal Government of the United States, who violated the terms, conditions, and limitations of the Constitution of the United States; and who have conspired under color of law to advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, desirability or propriety of entering the several states of the Union under force or arms outside Federal Enclaves and/or actually enter the several states of the Union under force of arms outside any Federal Enclave to violate the rights of the inhabitants of the several states of the Union protected by the Constitution and Laws of the

United States, thereby advocating the overthrow of the several states of the Union, engaged in Sedition against the states?

BASIS OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED IN QUESTION 19:

The several states of the Union in Congress, pursuant to Article III, Section 3, Clause 1, Treason, and Article III, Section 3, Clause 2, Punishment For Treason; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, All Necessary and Proper Laws, pursuant to the Act of Congress evidenced at 18 U.S.C. §2385, Advocating Overthrow of Government, provides that: "Whoever knowingly or willfully abets, advises, or teaches the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying the government of the United States or the government of any state, territory, district, or possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein, by force or violence, or by the assassination of any officer of any such government ..." is an Act of Criminal Misconduct.

The Tenth Amendment, as well as Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, limits the powers of the Federal Government to only those powers specifically delegated to the Federal Government which have by implementation of the several states of the Union in Congress, through specific legislation. All other Federal Powers delegated by the Constitution remain dormant unless implemented by the several states of the Union in Congress.

The act of Federal Officers, Agents, and Employees who enter the several states of the Union outside Federal Enclaves under color of Federal Authority and under force of arms, are engaged in usurpation of state sovereignty and authority, in direct violation of the Tenth Amendment; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution; as well as 40 U.S.C. §3112; which limits Federal Territorial, Legislative, and Judicial Jurisdiction in the several states of the Union to Federal Enclaves. Such conduct would be subject to state jurisdiction for Sedition against the several states of the Union, under the laws of the several states of the Union.

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENT DEMANDED [QUESTION 19]:

It is therefore Declared that any Officer, Agent, or Employee of the Federal Government of the United States, who after agreeing by oath or affirmation to uphold the Supreme Law of the Land in order to secure an office of trust, honor, or profit with the Federal Government, who violates the terms, conditions, and limitations of the Constitution, and conspired under color of law to advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, desirability, or propriety of entering the several states of the Union under force of arms outside Federal Enclaves, and/or actually enters the several states of the Union under force of arms outside any Federal Enclave for the purpose of violating the rights

of the inhabitants of the several states of the Union protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, is engaged in the criminal misconduct of advocating the overthrow of the sovereign states of the Union in violation of the Tenth Amendment; in violation of Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; in violation of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17; in violation of 40 U.S.C. §3112; and in violation of 18 U.S.C. §2385; and is therefore subject to the jurisdiction of the state where such criminal misconduct occurred, for the Act of Sedition against said/such state.

#### II. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

The Petitioner at all times relevant to this Petition and Demand for Declaratory Judgment, Reserves the Right(s) protected by the Constitution and the Laws of the United States, to petition for redress of grievances, and for Further Necessary or Proper Relief based on the Declaratory Judgment or Decree; pursuant to the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2202, including but not limited to: (1) a Motion for Additional Relief; (2) an Action for Writ of Mandamus and/or injunctive relief, and/or other relief for the recovery of money damages and other equitable relief including Declaratory Relief as provided for, by, and within the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986; as well as 28 U.S.C. §1331, §1332, §1343; §2201 and §2202, against persons in his/her/their individual and private capacity; who, while acting under

color of Federal Office, including but not limited to the Office of Federal Judge, the United States Attorney General, the United States Attorney, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, having engaged in Conspiracy under Color of Federal Law to subject the Petitioner to the Deprivation of Rights protected by the Constitution and the Law of the United States.

The Petitioner is well aware, as evidenced by the Petition and Demand for Declaratory Judgment, that there are no defenses regarding the Statute of Limitations; regarding the Exhaustion of Administrative Remedy Requirements; nor regarding any Official Immunity for civil actions brought under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, evidenced at 42 U.S.C. §1983, §1985, and §1986 for the recovery of money damages and other equitable, injunctive, and declaratory relief when the party defendants are sued in his/her/their individual and private capacity(ies).

## III. CONCLUSION

As these Nineteen (19) Questions of Law are material and specific to the instant case of actual controversy with the jurisdiction of this Court for the filing of appropriate pleadings, it is the right of the Petitioner under the Act of Congress evidenced at 28 U.S.C. §2201 to Demand a Declaratory Judgment as to the foregoing Nineteen (19) Questions of Law specific to the rights of the Petitioner.

seeking such Declaration in his Demand to have the Nineteen (19) Questions of Law Declared.

It is therefore mandated by the aforementioned Act of Congress, and incumbent upon this Honorable Court to either Affirm or Deny each and all of these Judgments, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2201; and that the Constitutional and Statutory basis for ANY such Denial be provided in writing; and that this be done as a prerequisite and as a condition precedent prior to this case moving forward; as the foregoing Rules of Law/Judgments are critical to the underpinnings of the instant case.

The Declaratory Judgments Demanded Herein will be deemed Affirmed by Tacit Acceptance, should the court neglect or refuse to respond to this Declaratory Judgment Petition and Demand within sixty (60) days of the filing of this Petition.

Dated: September 21, 2017

STEVEN FISHMAN
Petitioner
Federal Register Number 17280-004
FCI Terminal Island
Post Office Box #3007
San Pedro, California 90733-3007

#### DECLARATION OF DELIVERY/SERVICE

- I, STEVEN FISHMAN, hereinafter the Declarant, hereby affirm and declare based on my personal knowledge, understanding and belief, as my free act and deed that:
- 1. I am of the age of majority, of sound mind, and competent to testify.
- 2. I, the Declarant, delivered an original, signed copy of PETITION AND DEMAND OF PETITIONER STEVEN FISHMAN FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT WITH REGARD TO QUESTIONS OF LAW, PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §2201, SEEKING REMEDY AND RELIEF REGARDING JURISDICTIONAL DEFECTS IN CASE NUMBER CR-88-0616-DLJ, to an Officer of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Federal Correctional Institution at Terminal Island, addressed to:

Clerk of the Court United States District Court Northern District of California 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 16th Floor San Francisco, California 94102

United States Attorney's Office 450 Golden Gate Avenue Post Office Box #36055 San Francisco, California 94102

to be placed in the outgoing Legal Mail.

- 3. I, the Declarant, can find no evidence that since I am in custody, that the documents referred to in Statement 2 are not in fact filed and/or served when delivered to an Officer of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, to be placed in the outgoing Legal Mail, pursuant to Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266, 270-271, 108 S.Ct. 2379, 101 L.Ed.2d 245 (1988); Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(b); and Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 25. Service and/or filing of the documents referred to in Statement 2 is perfected on this 21st day of September, 2017.
- 4. I, the Declarant, have nothing further to state at this time. I hereby affirm and declare under the penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1746 that the foregoing facts are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, understanding and belief.

Executed on this 21st day of September, 2017

STEVEN FISHMAN, Declarant Fed. Reg. No. 17280-004

FCI Terminal Island, Box #3007 San Pedro, California 90733-3007